DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 625 JC 800 177

AUTHOR Bers, John A.
TITLE Integrating Student Follow-Up into the Institutional Planning Process: A Case Study.
PUB DATE 9 Apr 80
NOTE 90p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 7-11, 1980). Appendices 5, 6, and 7 may not reproduce well. Appendices 11, 17, and 18 were removed due to irreproducibility

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Problems; Adoption (Ideas); College Administration; College Planning; *Community Colleges; Data Analysis; Data Collection; Employer Attitudes; Faculty College Relationship; *Followup Studies; Graduate Surveys; Institutional Research; Long Range Planning; Questionnaires; *Research Design; Research Directors; Research Methodology; Research Needs; *Research Problems; *Research Utilization; Sampling; School Surveys; Two Year Colleges; Two Year College Students; Vocational Followup
IDENTIFIERS *Gadsden State Junior College AL

ABSTRACT

A student follow-up system was designed and implemented at Gadsden State Junior College (GSJC) in Alabama which revealed several administrative problems in integrating student follow-up into the institutional planning process. Development of the system involved tailoring existing pre-packaged follow-up methodologies to meet GSJC's individual needs and included six steps: (1) identifying goals and associated performance indicators that could be measured using questionnaires; (2) developing and testing three questionnaires designed to gather information from current students (at the completion of each quarter), students who have been out of college for one year, and employers of former students; (3) operationally defining the sample populations appropriate to each questionnaire; (4) conducting the survey of current students in class and of employers and former students by mail; (5) computer analysis of the data; and (6) reporting the results to administrative personnel. Interim study results revealed four major problems--low response rate, inappropriateness of goals and performance indicators to non-traditional students, lack of commitment on the part of college personnel, and the resultant small impact of the project on institutional planning. The report concludes with a list of recommendations for follow-up study implementation, and is appended by survey instruments and study data. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED184625

INTEGRATING STUDENT FOLLOW-UP INTO THE INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING PROCESS

A Case Study

by John A. Bers
Planning Officer
University of Alabama in Birmingham
Birmingham, Alabama 35294

Paper Presented To

The American Educational Research Association

Boston, Massachusetts

April 9, 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John A. Bers

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JC 800 177

Copyright: 1980 John A. Bers

Printed in U.S.A.

INTEGRATING STUDENT FOLLOW-UP INTO THE INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING PROCESS

A Case Study

by John A. Bers
Planning Officer
University of Alabama in Birmingham
Birmingham, Alabama 35294

April 9, 1980

ABSTRACT

Despite the popularity of student follow-up studies, relatively little has been reported on the technical and political problems the researcher is likely to encounter while undertaking them. This study describes in detail six such problems arising at Gadsden State Junior College and the approaches taken to them. They include low response rate, assessing nonresponse bias, limits on survey validity, merging survey data with institutional files, faculty resistance, and integrating survey results into the institutional planning process. Many but not all of these problems were eventually overcome. All of them should be taken into account by researchers attempting similar studies.

CONTENTS

Abstract i

Purpose of the Study 1

Background 3

Methodology 6

Interim Results 19

Discussion 21

Recommendations. 27

References 29

Appendices 30

INTEGRATING STUDENT FOLLOW-UP INTO THE INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING PROCESS

A Case Study

by

John A. Bers
Planning Officer
University of Alabama in Birmingham

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

A considerable amount has been published recently on recommended approaches to conducting student follow-up studies in colleges and universities. But with this new concept only beginning to take hold around the country, relatively little consideration has been given to actual institutional experience with student follow-up, to the problems and concerns which surface at the institution, and to its impact on institutional planning and management. This study is one of the first to deal with these issues in some detail. Survey instruments, data formats, and analytical reports developed during the project are appended for researchers wishing to apply this approach in their own institutions.

The method used is the case study approach, specifically the case of Gadsden State Junior College in Alabama, where the author put into operation a student follow-up system while serving as Director of the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) from April 1975 to July 1979. Limited as it is to a single institution, the case study can always be challenged with respect to the generalizability of that institution's experience to other settings. But in another sense, the case study focuses on where "the rubber meets the road," where theory is put into practice. It is only through the careful documentation and analysis of the process in operation that the theory will be tested

and perhaps improved. If enough such cases are thoroughly documented, scholars may begin to make valid generalizations that do have useful application across a range of settings.

BACKGROUND

Longitudinal follow-up studies of students' educational and career progress have been a part of the community college movement almost from its start, perhaps for the simple reason that the educational and career paths of those enrolling in community colleges are so nontraditional. Indeed, the raison d'être of the community college is its capacity to serve the student for whom more traditional educational/career pathways are unfeasible. Regarding themselves as more "market-oriented" than either public schools or four-year colleges and universities, community colleges have viewed student follow-up surveys as a key marketing tool - a way to obtain feedback both from their clients, the students themselves, and from the "receiving" institutions--transfer institutions and the workplace—to help them assess their performance, improve their programs, counsel their current students, and perhaps, attract more students.

A recent surge of interest in student follow-up on community college campuses was prompted by the well-known reduction in the college-age student pool and in the resultant decrease in enrollment-driven state appropriations. As student enrollments have peaked and as institutions have struggled to hold on to those they have, follow-up surveys have come to be seen as valuable tools for learning the causes of student attrition and finding ways to improve retention.

A recent federal statute, Education Amendments of 1976, has made student follow-up the law of the land. This act requires postsecondary institutions offering occupational programs to begin tracking the career and educational progress of their occupational students, effective July, 1979. The results must be summarized and reported to the federal government and to the states to help them evaluate the institutions' performance in serving the needs of career education students.(1)

The student follow-up project at Gadsden State was undertaken to satisfy the requirements of another federal program in which the College was taking part, the Developing Institutions program.(2) Institutions receiving grant funds through this program are required to develop a planning, management, and evaluation system by which, "...the institutional mission is logically translated into specific objectives (planning); policy and operating decisions are aimed at achieving the stated objectives (management); performance is weighed against the intended outcomes in the plans (evaluation); and the resultant information is fed back to the planning and management functions...".(3) Student follow-up at Gadsden State was not an isolated institutional research project, but rather an element in the development of Gadsden States planning, management, and evaluation system.

Fortunately for Gadsden State and other institutions, the combined pressures of federal and state legislation and the press of declining enrollments have been met by considerable effort at the institutional, state, and national levels to develop student follow-up technology. The best known contributor has been the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), which over the decade 1970-79 developed guiding principles of student outcomes assessment, surveys, and supporting software. NCHEMS' most recent synthesis of its outcomes assessment work, published in collaboration with the College Board, is a 1979 handbook, Student-Outcomes Questionnaires: An Implementation Handbook.(4)

The most ambitious state-level effort surely must be the Texas Student Information System (TEX-SIS), created by act of the Texas Legislature and developed by a consortium of state community colleges under the leadership of Dr. Jim F. Reed, then of Tarrant County (TX) Junior College. The TEX-SIS project took NCHEMS' earlier work a major step further by developing, testing, and implementing on a statewide basis a series of follow-up questionnaires

for entering students, graduates, employers, early leavers, and continuing education students.(5)

Individual community colleges have further developed the concepts and practices of student follow-up. Mercer County (NJ) Community College, as an example, pioneered the development of a longitudinal student information system which combines student outcome data with institutional files. The college can access this information system to monitor and analyze enrollment, persistence, and performance trends.(6)

As a logical outgrowth of recent developments, NCHEMS and the College Board recently announced the creation of a Student-Outcomes Information Service, which supplies the researcher with detailed procedures, questionnaires, a questionnaire analysis service, and comparative student-outcomes data.(4)

The individual institution may be finding itself caught in the cogs between the governing and funding agencies demanding student follow-up data on the one hand and the emergence of highly automated, standardized, prepackaged student follow-up technology on the other. Is there still opportunity for the institution to tailor student follow-up methodology to meet its individual planning needs, or is student follow-up doomed to follow in the footsteps of other well-intentioned data collection activities into a mindless, purposeless, paper-pushing exercise? Perhaps some light will be shed on this question in the discussion of Gadsden State's approach to student follow-up that follows.

METHODOLOGY

It was mentioned earlier that the student follow-up project at Gadsden State was an integral part of an institutional planning process that had been launched earlier. (Reader interested in further background on this planning process are advised to consult references 7 and 8.) Accordingly, decisions about questionnaire design, sampling, and the analysis and reporting of results were guided for the most part by the requirements of the planning process. In this respect the project was distinctive to Gadsden State. But in carrying out the follow-up the author borrowed freely from the published materials discussed in the preceding section, in particular from the 1977 field review edition(9) of the NCHEMS handbook(4) the latest edition available at the time. Thus, in many respects Gadsden State's follow-up project resembled those conducted by other institutions. The discussion of methodology below will concentrate on the application of published approaches to Gadsden State, citing the relevant sources where appropriate rather than reciting their content. Gadsden State's approach consisted of the following six phases: (1) development of goals and associated performance indicators, (2) survey design, (3) selection of sample, (4) survey administration, (5) data analysis, and (6) reporting of results. As the discussion proceeds, reference is made to the documents under discussion, which are contained in the appendices.

Phase 1: Development of Goals and Associated Performance Indicators.

This phase was carried out early in the planning process under the auspices of the College's Committee on Institutional Planning (CIP), a broadly representative group which provides guidance and oversight to the planning process. Goals were established at the institutional level, at the level of the four deans, and at the divisional level (including both academic divisions and supportive service units). Institutional goals are listed in Appendix 1.

The process used to arrive at the goals, a broad-based delphi approach, is described in a previous report. (7)

To recast each goal in specific and measurable terms, the College selected several performance indicators and assigned desired attainment levels to them. The performance indicators for the institutional goals are shown in Appendix 2, with the planned attainment levels displayed in Appendix 3. Many of these performance indicators were drawn from NCHEMS' Outcomes Measures and Procedures Manual(10). Deans, division chairpersons, and other administrators then developed performance indicators for their areas, in many cases by simply disaggregating the institutional performance indicators to the appropriate level. Using several performance indicators for each goal served the two purposes of capturing more dimensions of the goal and providing concurrent sources of confirmation for goal attainment.

Selecting performance indicators that could be measured with student follow-up questionnaires was easiest in career programs (business, health occupations, and vocational-technical programs), where a clearly identifiable group of students pursues a predetermined curriculum leading to a degree or certificate, perhaps a license examination, and a job in the same field. On the other hand, core disciplines and transfer programs enrolled students having different majors or who were undecided. To confuse matters further, additional students would appear each quarter, and many wouldn't even complete the quarter. The career-directed continuity of effort and the predetermined sequence of activities of the career students, which lends itself so easily to follow-up technology, simply didn't make sense for many transfer or undecided students. For this larger block of students, the CIP decided to use the course, rather than the program, as the unit of analysis and the mastery of course objectives as the measure of success. (See Indicators 1.02-1.03 of Appendix 2) (Development of course objectives was the concern of another

activity of the Title III grant.)

The College found the state-of-the-art of performance measurement even less developed in the nonacademic units--student services, business affairs, community services, libraries, auxiliary services, plant operation, etc. But follow-up technology did lend itself readily to assessing student use of and satisfaction with some of these services (see Appendix 5, questions 16-68).

Phase 2: Survey Design.

Performance data that could be obtained through student follow-up could be most conveniently collected at three points in the student's education-career path: at the time he completes his studies; about a year later, when he is at work or school in the next stage of his career; and somewhat later, when his employer has had a chance to evaluate his on-the-job performance. Accordingly, three questionnaires were designed: an Exiting Student Questionnaire (Appendix 5) to assess student satisfaction with his college experience and to learn his reasons for leaving; a Student Follow-up Questionnaire (Appendix 6) to learn about his educational and career progress since leaving the College; and an Employer Follow-up Questionnaire (Appendix 7) to obtain the employer's evaluation of how well the College prepared the employee for his job.

The three questionnaires were designed, tested, and brought on-stream over a three-year period, which made it possible to do a complete follow-up on the same cohort of exiting students. The three-year period also allowed ample time for revising the questionnaires and refining the survey administration procedures. The three-year lead time could be cut if an institution finds that one of the prepackaged questionnaires meets its needs with little or no modification. For example, when the field review versions of the NCHEMS questionnaires(9) became available, the College adopted most of their format, but little of their content in the Exiting Student Questionnaire and both

format and a considerable proportion of content for the Student Follow-up Questionnaire. The TEX-SIS employer follow-up survey(5) was found to be so well thought out that the College could adopt it virtually unchanged.

The Exiting Student Questionnaire and Student Follow-up Questionnaire were revised several times over the three years in response to testing and feedback from students and faculty. The greatest emphasis was placed on shortening the questionnaire, simplifying the language of directions and questions, and improving the appearance and layout of the forms. To facilitate keypunching of responses, questions and response choices were coded in collaboration with the Computer Center.

Special pains were taken in the printing of the questionnaire. A local printing company was contracted to prepare a "Velox" high-resolution photographic master for about four hundred dollars. A seventy-pound book grade paper in three pastel colors was selected for copying the questionnaires on the College's Xerox 9200 photocopier. Appendices 5-7 are actual copies of the questionnaires duplicated at the College. The high resolution on the master was found necessary to ensure legibility of the small print on the photocopies.

Phase 3: Selection of Sample.

A cohort population of student respondents for the Exiting Student Questionnaire was operationally defined as all students formally enrolled in a degree program who do not intend to re-enroll the following quarter. For the Student Follow-up Questionnaire, a cohort was operationally defined as any student who had been enrolled for any quarter in the previous academic year and who had not enrolled for the current Fall Quarter. These definitions included all students irrespective of reason for leaving, academic status, date initially admitted, or credit hours attempted or awarded. Because a number of students at Gadsden State stop in and out of the College more than once, there were

instances in which the same student received the student questionnaires more than once, but this phenomenon was not judged to be of significant statistical merit.

For the first round of the Employer Follow-up Survey the employer population was defined as the persons listed as immediate supervisors by respondents to the Student Follow-up Questionnaire (Question 25) irrespective of whether the student had completed his program prior to employment; whether the student considered his job to be related to his major field of study; or whether he got the job before, during, or after his studies at Gadsden State.

For all three questionnaires the writer decided to survey the entire population of each cohort, rather than a sample, at least for the first cohort of exiters. Both in defining the respondent populations and in the decision to survey the entire population rather than sampling the writer was choosing a "shotgun" approach that would maximize the absolute number of responses rather than a more targeted approach. This decision was made for three reasons. First, response rates to test administrations of the Exiting Student Questionnaire indicated that the total response in a live run would have been insufficient for making valid inferences to the population. Second, since the College did not have a record of students' current major field of study, there would have been no way to ensure that every major field would be sufficiently represented in any random sample. Analysis of the results by major field was essential to the assessment of the performance of individual academic programs. Third, sampling would have reduced the opportunity, due to diminished cell sizes, to analyze responses according to student characteristics.

Phase 4: Survey Administration.

This phase consisted of the actual distribution, collection, logging, and

coding of the questionnaires. The Exiting Student Questionnaire was administered by the faculty during the first fifteen minutes of each class on a predetermined day about two weeks before term finals for each term during the 1977-78 academic year.

The following November, Student Follow-up Questionnaires were mailed to the permanent addresses of the 1977-78 exiters. The mailing was timed to arrive over the Thanksgiving holidays when, it was presumed, many of the former students who had moved out-of-town for work or school would be at the permanent mailing address listed in the College's student file. The Employer Follow-up Questionnaire was mailed the following spring.

Mailing procedures followed those recommended by NCHEMS.(9) Mailing labels printed by the Computer Center from student files were fastened to a space provided on the questionnaires themselves. The questionnaires were mailed in preprinted Number Ten window envelopes (Appendix 8). The mailing label on the questionnaire made it unnecessary to use a second label on the envelope, shortened the questionnaire itself (Since the College knew students' names and addresses, there was not reason to ask for them.), and made it easier for the planning office secretary to positively identify respondents during the logging in of returned questionnaires. The postage option chosen was bulk rate (2.7¢ each) combined with "Return Postage Guaranteed" so that questionnaires mailed to out-of-date addresses were returned at an additional cost of 15¢ each. These questionnaires were then remailed first class (15¢ each) so that the post office would forward them to the students' new address. This way, the vast majority of respondents were reached by the much cheaper bulk rate. Accompanying the Student and Employer Follow-up Questionnaires were a cover letter (Appendix 9) and a Number Nine self-addressed business reply envelope (Appendix 10).

As completed questionnaires were returned, the planning office secretary

logged them in on a response log printed by the Computer Center (Appendix 11). About two weeks after the first mailing, reminder post cards (Appendix 12) were sent to nonrespondents shown on the response log. Two weeks after that, a second questionnaire, return envelope, and cover letter (Appendix 13) were sent to the remaining nonrespondents. A thank-you note was sent to employer respondents shortly after the last follow-up letter (Appendix 14).

The two follow-up mailings were well worth the effort, increasing total response rate by a very substantial margin. The response rate to the single administration of the Exiting Student Questionnaire, which did not have a follow-up, was a very disappointing 554 out of 2900 (20%). On the other hand, the total response for the Student Follow-up Questionnaire, including both follow-up mailings was 1140 out of 2700 (42%), more than double that of the Exiting Student Questionnaire, and for the Employer Follow-up Questionnaire, 400 out of 566 (71%), or three and one-half times the response to the Exiting Student Questionnaire.

A number of questions, such as major field of study, school attended, and job title, permitted open-ended responses. This shortened and simplified the questionnaires considerably, but it also meant the planning office had to code the responses. The office used the HEGIS discipline codes for coding student majors(11), the Higher Education Directory's FICE Code for coding transfer college attended(12), and the first three digits of the job codes in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles for coding job titles.(13) The job definition section occupying the back half of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles proved indispensable in determining the best three-digit code for even the most unusual jobs. The few other codes needed were developed locally (Appendix 15).

Phase 5: Data Analysis

The form the data analysis took was dictated primarily by the institutional,

academic, and administrative performance indicators (Appendices 2 and 3). But furnishing the data as defined by the performance indicators was considered only a point of departure. The important questions on which the follow-up surveys could help shed light concerned the reasons why the performance results turned out as they did, and what steps could be taken to improve performance further. For example, which groups of students were "succeeding" at Gadsden State in terms of program completion, grades, satisfaction with the College, and future academic and occupational success? Is a student's success or failure related in any statistically significant way to his age, race, or sex, major field of study, credit hours attempted, or educational goals? What attributes characterize the noncompleter? Are off-campus or evening students as successful or as satisfied with the College as main campus day students?

A less exciting question that nonetheless had to be considered if the results were to be credible was the extent of response bias: to what extent were inferences from the survey respondents to the entire cohort population biased by the "unrepresentativeness" of the respondents themselves? To test for representativeness of the respondents, the Office intended to run statistical comparisons of respondents and nonrespondents on demographic and educational characteristics available in the College's student master file: age, sex, race, permanent address (as indicated by zip code), veteran status, credit hours attempted, and cumulative grade point average. Should the two groups differ significantly on any of these characteristics, the Office could apply weighting factors to correct for any over- or under-representativeness in the respondent group.(14)

The method of attack was to develop a longitudinal student data base which would merge the survey data with data then in the Computer Center's student file. The data base was defined and data processing requirements were described in a memo to the Computer Center Director (Appendix 16).

Having gone this far to design, administer, and code the surveys and to define output requirements, the writer was inclined to believe that it was now a straightforward data processing problem for the Computer Center. It was at this point, however, where many of the serious logistical and technical difficulties arose.

The student file in Gadsden State's Computer Center is rather typical for community colleges. It evolved over a period of years as specific applications, such as registration and grade reporting, were automated in whole or part. The resulting file system, though reasonably effective in serving the intended applications, is poorly equipped to meet the demands of planners and managers for the synthesis, display, and analysis of data. As an example of this problem, the science division chairman wanted to correlate the science majors' performance in science at Gadsden State with performance in science at their transfer institutions. But because individual course grades were in a separate file from the student master and because programming time for special applications was scarce, questions of this sort were not pursued.

Another set of problems arose from the punch card technology around which the Computer Center was organized. A decision had been made years earlier when the computer was acquired to accommodate all student records on a single 96-column card. As administrative data requirements increased, the student record quickly expanded to the 96 available columns. To add more fields would have required a second card for each of the tens of thousands of students enrolling over the years. Rather than expanding record length, the Computer Center created separate files for other applications as they arose, or removed "nonessential" fields from the original record. Two such nonessential fields--student major and first quarter enrolled--were indeed essential for analyzing follow-up data by cohorts of entering classmates in a program.

These two items had to be elicited on the questionnaires themselves, relying on the sometimes faulty memory of the student respondents.

A third limitation on the Computer Center, the low capacity of its disks, meant that only those records for students enrolled in the current quarter could be maintained on-line at any time. Inactive student records were stored on cards off-line and could not be merged with active records without special programming. In the Computer Center's application-oriented environment, in which only active records required processing, this limitation rarely presented a problem. But, for example, when the Office of Planning and Research requested a list of students who had exited the previous academic year for the Student Follow-up Questionnaire, the names were almost irretrievable.

Finally, the computer's main memory had nowhere near the capacity to support large-scale statistical programs, such as SPSS, which could produce summary statistics and tables--frequency distributions, cross-tabulations, means, standard deviations, and various measures of association.

To circumvent these limitations, the Office of Planning and Research and the Computer Center tried something that is often urged upon community colleges with limited computing capacity: put the data on tape and hand-carry it to a nearby university with sufficient in-house hardware, software, and programming expertise. This approach, however, created its own set of problems. Because the College's and the university's computers had incompatible data input and output devices (although both were IBM products), third and fourth party installations had to be found to convert the data from one format to the other, creating months of delays. And once the conversion was completed, it was discovered that student master data for nonrespondents (necessary for the nonresponse bias analysis) had not been included in the conversion. Rather than delay several more months and inconvenience a lot of parties whose good will was essential, the writer decided to skip the response bias analysis and

carry it out on the following year's survey. Several months later, one of the outside parties changed hardware and could no longer participate in the data conversion, leaving the College high and dry for the future.

Even after the data were "up" on the university's installation, the College's problems were hardly at an end. The programmer assigned by the Computer Center to process the data at the University site was unfamiliar with the statistical analysis package (SPSS) to be used. He had to make several all-day trips to the university before even the frequency distributions were in proper form. If the results were to be distributed in anything approaching timely fashion, the writer decided to settle for the frequency distributions and cross-tabulations only, leaving off means, standard deviations, and other output originally requested (Appendix 16). Samples of the output, including a frequency distribution and a cross-tabulation, are displayed in Appendices 17 and 18, respectively.

One incident occurred in the survey analysis that seemed trivial was blown far out of proportion, nearly aborting the follow-up project permanently. One respondent to the Student Follow-up Questionnaire reported his immediate supervisor's name as "Dummy" Cooper. The name was faithfully keypunched and printed on the address label of the Employer Follow-up Questionnaire sent to Mr. Cooper. This gentleman wrote a furious letter to the president of the College, and after both written and verbal apologies were offered the incident was considered closed and forgotten. Several months later the writer decided to send a courtesy copy of the highlights of the follow-up results to employers who had responded. Surely enough, the mailing label on Mr. Cooper's copy still read "Dummy". This time Mr. Cooper called the president, but this one had just taken office a few days earlier, following his predecessor's retirement. The very first contact the writer had with the new president was for the purpose of receiving a firm reprimand about the need for good will from the public.

The president nearly decided on the spot to discontinue the entire project. Needless to say, following that unfortunate incident, the writer personally checked every word written on every questionnaire before it was sent to the Computer Center.

Once the raw summary data were back in the Office of Planning and Research, the remaining analysis went much more smoothly. An important component of the data analysis that was handled entirely by the Office was the analysis of the comments and suggestions elicited at the end of the questionnaires. Perhaps as many as a fourth of the student and employee respondents wrote comments, of which the overwhelming majority were pertinent and constructive. The comments were sorted by the respondent's major field of study and recorded with a minimum of editing for understandability. A sample of comments from business administration majors is displayed in Appendix 19. Although the comments did not add a lot of new information, they lent a certain depth to the results—a sense of what was really going on out there--that just hadn't come through in the numbers.

The comments also contributed in an important, if undefinable way to the final narrative report (Appendix 20). The two-part report, consisting of highlights, detailed analysis of the data, and policy implications for the College, is self-explanatory. One finding does deserve comment: the great number of students whose programs and career paths differ from the traditional transfer and career pathways predetermined by the College (see Appendix 20, pp. 1-2, 5-7). This was a genuinely unexpected finding; to the best of the writer's knowledge, nobody at the College from the president on down knew just how different the student body was from the College's expectations. This discovery suggested the need for some fundamental rethinking of the College's "delivery system," as discussed in the policy implication's section of the report (Appendix 20, pp. 12-13).

Phase 5: Reporting of Results.

The results of the follow-up project were reported to the college community in several forms. Actual attainment levels on the goals were reported in the form of a status report (planned vs. actual). The report on achievement of institutional goals (Appendix 21) was distributed to all administrators and division chairpersons participating in the planning process. A similar report was prepared for each individual administrator relative to his own attainment levels.

As a back-up, each administrator was furnished a copy of the frequency distributions and cross-tabulations of responses to the three questionnaires by students in his or her program. This data allowed him to analyze the whole gamut of responses by his students and their employers, not just those that related to his performance indicators. An annotated sample page of the outputs (Appendices 17 and 18) was sent along to help administrators to interpret the results.

In addition to the quantitative data, each administrator was sent a summary of the comments by his students and employees (Appendix 19) and a copy of the complete narrative report (Appendix 20).

A courtesy copy of the complete report was sent to all faculty members, both for the insights it might provide and as a gesture of appreciation for their cooperation (cover letter in Appendix 22.1). A courtesy copy of the highlights section of the narrative report was sent to all student respondents who had requested it (Exiting Student Questionnaire item 74) (cover letter in Appendix 22.2) and to all employer respondents (cover letter in Appendix 22.3). A copy of the highlights was also distributed to the local news media.

Interim Results

The impact of the student follow-up project on planning and decision-making at the College can be reported only on an interim basis. At the time the final narrative report was issued, a new president had just been appointed and was getting oriented, putting the student follow-up project on a "back burner". A few months later the writer left the College for another position. Thus, only the earliest results are available.

As of July, 1979, the survey results had not been incorporated in a visible way into the life of the College. They were not used, for example, in appraising administrators' performance or for guiding resource allocation decisions. The President's Administrative Council never took up the survey results on its agenda. Other, more immediate operational matters and crises consumed their attention. But the Committee on Institutional Planning, an advisory committee which is specifically concerned with longer range issues, did consider the results. A taskforce of the Committee reviewed the findings and recommended an update to the College's routine performance objectives (see Appendix 3). The Committee also revised the innovative and problem-solving objectives (an earlier version is shown in Appendix 4).

At the divisional and program level, where presumably more direct actions could be taken, the level of follow-through on performance results has been variable. Where there is commitment to the College's planning process, where it is valued as a vehicle for program development and improvement, the results have been used. In quarters where the planning process is regarded as a burden or a threat, no amount of persuasion, assistance, or direction from above has made any difference.

One early benefit for institutional planning and decision-making was unexpected. In the early nineteen seventies the College's Computer Center was able to perform some minor miracles of administrative data processing with

a tiny computer and a shoe-string budget. As the College grew and administrative data processing demands multiplied, the Computer Center's limited capabilities were quickly reached and exceeded, and the Computer Center came to be regarded as more of a constraint than an aid to administrative operations. The data processing difficulties encountered in conducting the student follow-up analysis provided just the rationale needed for a major upgrade in the College's computing capabilities. By redirecting its federal Title III funds and institutional matching funds, the College was able to acquire the equipment needed to link the Computer Center directly to the nearby university computer that had been used for processing the surveys. Included in the upgrade were both a remote batch entry station and video display stations for on-line access to the university installation by all major administrative offices. It is hoped that this arrangement will eventually solve not only the data processing problems arising from the follow-up survey but a host of other administrative data processing problems as well.

Discussion

Of the many issues and problems that were raised by the student follow-up project at Gadsden State, four major ones stand out: low response rate; inappropriateness of follow-up technology to a large proportion of community college students; faculty and administrative resistance to student follow-up; and the impact of student follow-up on institutional planning and decision-making.

Low response rate:

Response to the Employer Follow-up Questionnaire was a respectable 71%, but response to the Student Follow-up Questionnaire was a barely acceptable 42%, and to the Exiting Student Questionnaire, a disappointing 20% despite follow-up mailings and make-up administrations. Response rates of twenty and forty percent can undo whatever credibility the surveys may have, and they certainly contribute to the project's lack of impact on institutional planning.

Part of this low response rate can be attributed to logistical difficulties which are presumably soluble. The attempt to survey exiting students in class is now recognized as a mistake. It missed students who had dropped out earlier in the quarter (certainly a group one would want to include in the survey) or who were absent for both the original and make-up administrations. It erroneously included students who changed their minds and decided to register the following quarter. In addition, many faculty members resented the administrative intrusion on instructional time. This resentment was not confined to this particular project; it extended to passing out delinquent library book notices, unpaid parking fine notices, and counseling and retention materials for the Student Services offices. The argument against all of these chores was that the classroom is a place for nothing but teaching and learning. The problem with that argument is that the community college student is often much less "connected" to the institution than his counterpart at a traditional college or high school; he squeezes in

classes between work or military or homemaking responsibilities and doesn't have time for "homeroom" or other extracurricular activity times during which administrative paperwork such as student surveys can be disposed of.

These problems could be handled simply by mailing the Exiting Student Questionnaires to the students' home address shortly after they exit. As of the most recent survey administration the Office was planning to do this. But using the mail was found to create its own difficulties apart from the time and expense involved. One factor reducing response rate by several percentage points was the large number of undeliverable questionnaires. Part of the problem here was that the College did not have a fail-safe way to update its permanent student address file, relying upon the student to remember to report address changes.

Perhaps a more important reason for low response rate, whether the surveys were administered in person or through the mails, is the lack of any incentive for the students to fill out the questionnaires. This contrasts with significant personal consequences for the student who fails to fill out an application for admission or financial aid. The various institutional offices that help with survey administration (such as the Registrar's Office) also lack any real incentive to maximize participation in the follow-up surveys. No state finance department auditors will be descending on personnel who don't get adequate participation, nor will any state education department personnel be scrutinizing follow-up surveys as they do student credit hour production reports. And so even when administrative offices are fully supportive of the follow-up project, the questionnaires have to take second seat.

What it boils down to is that the follow-up surveys are not part of the institution's individual transactional system as are applications for admission or financial aid, grade reports, transcripts, payroll reports, purchase requisitions, etc. An alternative that needs to be explored more deeply is

how to tap into various transactional data files without violating individual privacy. A good example is the Junior College Transfer Student Information System developed at Auburn University, one of the major transfer institutions for Gadsden State students.(15) This system reports cumulative Auburn grades of transfer students back to the junior colleges annually at almost no cost and virtually 100% "response rate."

Inappropriateness of student follow-up to many community college students:

The student follow-up surveys developed at Gadsden State were predicated on the assumption that students pursue a reasonably predictable educational path that includes the selection of a major, a year or two of formal education, completion of a program of studies, and fairly rapid entry either into a transfer institution with junior standing or into a job in their major field. It took the follow-up surveys themselves to explode that myth. To quote from the final narrative report itself, students

> "...use Gadsden State as an educational resource on an intermittent basis to advance their long-range career or personal development as the constraints of job, family, funds, and other commitments permit—while only 10% formally graduate with an associate's degree (fairly typical of the nation), over half (54%) of those who have exited plan to return to the College in a future quarter." (Appendix 20, pp. 1-2)

Thus, for a majority of Gadsden State's students a conventional follow-up approach is inappropriate. The survey showed that a substantial minority pursues a traditional education path, but the College has no clear, unambiguous way of distinguishing them from those who enroll in a couple of courses for personal or occupational improvement, nor would it be consistent with institutional policy to attempt to draw such distinctions.

The inappropriateness of the follow-up approach to such large numbers of students may help to account for the poor response rates. It could be that response rate was much higher among "traditional" students than for others, but this is difficult to verify. As of the most recent round of surveys the Office

of Planning and Research had decided to narrow its very broad definition of exiting students and former students to those who either had completed a program or were awarded at least some minimum number of credit hours. At least this would exclude the students who had enrolled in just one or two courses.

The depression in response rate is not the only problem arising from the inappropriateness of the questionnaires to many students. For the nontraditional student who does respond to the surveys, a number of questions are raised about proper interpretation of the survey results. Suppose a former student reports that he has a job in his major field. Shouldn't a different interpretation be attached to this result if he had been working in that same job before enrolling at Gadsden State than if he had obtained the job after leaving the College? Gadsden State certainly has no right to claim credit for preparing him to get the job in the first place.

As suggested in the final narrative report, the College should consider alternative, more flexible ways of tracking student progress. Gadsden State does deserve credit for serving the student who needs only one or two courses to advance his job skills or personal development. Successful course completion may ultimately become the most valid measure of performance for many students and many departments in what has become a highly modularized, individualized educational institution in spite of itself.

Faculty and administrative resistance to student follow-up:

One would be less than totally candid to pass over this phenomenon lightly. Resistance to the follow-up project did surface both among faculty members and administrators, although in different guises. Faculty opposition to the use of class time to administer surveys cannot be attributed to academic scruples alone. The writer heard reports from students of some faculty members disparaging the surveys or discouraging them from completing them. In a number of conversations it became obvious that some faculty members feared the results might

somehow be used against them individually. Although it would be impossible to disaggregate the survey results below the discipline level, some disciplines were taught by only one or two faculty members, so that in theory the results could be used in individual faculty evaluations.

Resistance among administrators took a slightly different form. Administrators are particularly accustomed to espousing the community college "religion": a strong client orientation, flexibility, accountability to the community, etc. But for many of them the assessment of institutional performance based on student satisfaction and success is a genuinely new concept. Most of them come from public school administrative positions, where the concept is perhaps as alien as in any type of organization. Because of their personal identification with the College, it is not really possible for many of them to dissociate the disembodied concept of "institutional" performance from their own personal performance. For a small, but sometimes critical minority of administrators, feedback that could have negative implications for the College or for them is not welcome. Planning, as a process involving effort, decision-making, prioritizing, and evaluating, tended at Gadsden State to enjoy varying levels of commitment to begin with, and any component, such as student follow-up, that made the process more threatening was likely to weaken commitment to planning still further.

Impact of student follow-up on institutional planning and decision-making:

Clearly, the degree of resistance to student follow-up from faculty and, particularly, administrators plays an influential role on the extent to which these individuals use the survey results in institutional planning and decision-making. As the Interim Results section implied, life at the College goes on as before. When administrators want an improvement or a new program, they work for it, sometimes unceasingly; when they don't perceive something to be a problem, no survey results have changed their minds. For the fact of the matter

is there isn't a natural constituency among institutional decision-makers for student follow-up data or other outcomes data as there is for, say, financial or enrollment data. Even in an institution such as Gadsden State that has taken every reasonable step to integrate student outcomes data into planning and budgeting, the existence of a planning process that "consumes" student outcomes data is not sufficient justification for regarding that data seriously.

On the other hand, nobody ever claimed that there must be an easily identifiable connection between feedback on performance and decision-making about future operations. Performance feedback may ultimately affect planning and future performance in subtle ways that aren't easily traceable. The lack of impact at Gadsden State may also be a function of time. When the survey results were reported, it was a first time through for the College. It may be that if the follow-up system should become a routine institutional function, as the novelty wears off, as the response rates are raised, as other logistical problems are straightened out, and as the staff discovers that the most threatening implications never materialize, the College may begin gradually to assimilate student follow-up into its decision processes. Even if the results of student follow-up do not lead directly to programmatic changes, the very existence of a continuous and comprehensive student follow-up process, especially if the law requires that its results be made available to the public, to state funding authorities, to prospective students, and to prospective employers of program completers, may ultimately alter deeply and irrovocably the way the institution functions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The lessons learned from Gadsden State's experience with student follow-up can best be summarized in the form of a few recommendations to other institutional researchers who are considering the undertaking of a student follow-up project.

1. Don't get into student follow-up in the first place unless you have a clear, distinct mandate from your president and, preferably, strong support from other key academic administrators. Doing it without their support could cancel any possible benefits because they can always find a way to discredit the results. "Political" appointees are particularly threatened by student follow-up since it could expose their incompetence.

2. Be on-the-level with faculty members and administrators from the outset about how the results will be used and, of course, keep your promises.

3. Don't get discouraged. Conducting student follow-up is harder than some would imagine, but it can be done and has been done at a lot of institutions. Although it seems hard to overstate the time and effort of launching the project, keep in mind that much of this is an unavoidable start-up cost that will be paid back by several years of returns.

4. Take it easy on yourself—don't try to do it all in one year. Phase it in, perhaps one questionnaire per year. That is about all the work you'll want to take on and probably about all the information your institution can absorb at one time.

5. Keep the questionnaires short and simple. This means you will have to set strict priorities on your data needs. The NCHEMS survey format was found to be too long and involved. The TEX-SIS format turned out just about right.

6. Be wary of the prepackaged student follow-up systems. They may or may not meet your needs or be right for your students. Discover what your institution's needs are first. Then you'll be in a position to evaluate available surveys and approaches.

7. Don't ask your faculty to administer the surveys in class. You'll create a lot of ill will toward you. Use mail or some other method even if it takes more time and money.

8. Unless you are one of the lucky few who have a sophisticated data processing installation with integrated student files and experience in survey research applications, be prepared for frustration and some long delays even with the most supportive computer center. A remote data processing site certainly is not what it's been advertised to be. Whichever approach to data processing you use, don't assume that it will take care of itself. And don't expect your institution to invest a lot of money to upgrade your installation just for your follow-up studies.

9. When analyzing your data, be alert to the unexpected. Pay particular attention to respondents' comments. The major surprise at Gadsden State was the vast number of students who were not traditional college types and who were using the College's resources in different ways from those that were predetermined by the faculty and administration.

10. Don't put all your eggs in this basket. Combine student follow-up with other performance indicators. Student follow-up is not a strong enough assessment technique to stand on its own. Take an especially careful look at data that could be retrieved from transactional files at "receiving" institutions such as transfer colleges or companies.

11. Finally, don't expect the follow-up to produce dramatic changes at your institution. Institutions assimilate new ideas slowly. It will take time for follow-up to work its way into the College's warp and weave.

REFERENCES

1) Education Amendments of 1976, Public Law 94-482, Title II, Sec. 112b, (20 USC 2312).

2) Higher Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89-329, Title III, as amended.

3) Definition furnished to recipient institutions by the Operations Branch, Strengthening Developing Institutions Program, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

4) Robert G. Gray, et.al., Student-Outcomes Questionnaires: An Implementation Handbook, Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, and New York, NY: The College Board, 1979.

5) Jim F. Reed, "The Research and Development of a Postsecondary Student Follow-up Management Information System for Texas (Project Follow-up)," Paper presented to the Association for Institutional Research, Sixteenth Annual Forum, Los Angeles, CA, 1976.

6) E. Timothy Lightfield, "They Do Come Back! Another View of Student Attrition," Community College Frontiers, Vol. 3, Spring, 1975, pp. 45-49.

7) John A. Bers, "Building the Planning Process into College Management," paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Ontario (Canada), March 31, 1978. ERIC Microfiche #ED 143 405.

8) John A. Bers, "Tying Resources to Results: Integrating the Resource Allocation Process into Planning and Management in a Public Two-Year College," paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA, April 12, 1979. ERIC Microfiche #ED 164 021.

9) Cathleen P. Bower and Nancy K. Renkiewicz, A Handbook for Using the Student Outcomes Questionnaire, Field Review Edition, Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1977.

10) Sidney S. Micek, Allan L. Service, and Yong S. Lee, Outcomes Measures and Procedures Manual, Technical Report 70, Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1975.

11) Sidney S. Micek, Allan L. Service, and Yong S. Lee, op.cit., Appendix C, pp. 277-289.

12) Arthur Podolsky and Carolyn R. Smith, Education Directory, Colleges and Universities, 1976-77, Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare.

13) Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Dictionary of Occupational Titles, Fourth Edition, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

14) Gray, et.al, op.cit., p. 55.

15) Gerald S. Leischuck, "Aiding the Articulation Process: A Junior College Transfer Student Information System," in Information for Decisions in Postsecondary Education, Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Forum, Association for Institutional Research, 1975, pp. 260-265.

APPENDICES

1. Institutional Goals. 31

2. Inventory of Performance Indicators for Institutional Goals. . . . 32

3. Five-year Institutional Objectives (Routine). 34

4. Innovative and Problem Solving Objectives--College-wide, 1978-83 . 36

5. Exiting Student Questionnaire. 37

6. Student Follow-up Questionnaire. 37

7. Employer Follow-up Questionnaire 37

8. Window Envelope Used in Questionnaire Mailout. 38

9. Cover Letter for Employer Follow-up Questionnaire. 39

10. Business Reply Envelope Enclosed with Questionnaires 40

11. Sample Page from Student Follow-up Questionnaire Response Log. . . 41

12. Post Card Reminder for Employer Follow-up Questionnaire. 42

13. Reminder Letter for Employer Follow-up Questionnaire. 43

14. Thank-you Letter to Employers. 44

15. Coding Key for Questionnaires. 45

16. Data Processing Requirements for Student Questionnaires. 46

17. Sample SPSS Frequency Distribution of Responses to Employer Follow-up Questionnaire (Annotated). 50

18. Sample SPSS Cross-tabulation of Responses to Employer Follow-up Questionnaire (Annotated). 51

19. Summary of Pertinent Comments by Employers of Former Business Majors. 52

20. Institutional Study #79-1. Gadsden State's Emerging Role: A Community-Wide Postsecondary Educational Resource. 53

    20.1 Highlights. 54
    20.2 Detailed Analysis and Policy Implications 57

21. 1977-78 Achievement of Institutional Goals. 67

22. Letters of Transmittal of Institutional Study 79-1. . . . . .

    22.1 Faculty and Administration. 73
    22.2 Former Students. 74
    22.3 Employers. 75

OPERATIONAL DATA

ORIGINATOR: A/President
DISTRIBUTION: W/All Planning Book Holders
SUBJECT: Institutional Goals

	THIS	REPLACES
FILE:	12.001	12.001
DATE:	6/19/78	2/14/77
PAGE:	1 OF 1	1 OF 2

Continuous and complex changes in educational needs, social environment and the diversity of possible action make it imperative that Gadsden State focus on clearly defined goals. Within the framework of the Alabama State Education Department's mandate -- and consistent with our basic purpose -- Gadsden State's three institutional goals are as follows

To contribute to the educational, cultural, economic, social, and recreational development of its seven-county service area by:

1. Offering instruction to each resident of the college's service area, and to others as the need arises, that will improve his or her academic, occupational, personal, or interpersonal knowledge and skills.

2. Helping each student to identify his or her personal goals, to develop plans for achieving these goals, and to carry out these plans with a sens of purpose, self-worth, and self-confidence.

3. Sponsoring or supporting other activities that promote the educational cultural, economic, social, and recreational development of the seven-county service area.

ORIGINATOR: A/President *ADSC.*
DISTRIBUTION: W/All Planning Book Holders
SUBJECT: Inventory of Performance Indicators for Institutional Goals

	THIS	REPLACES
FILE:	50.001	50.001
DATE:	6/19/78	2/14/77
PAGE:	1 OF 2	1 OF 5

These performance indicators will be applied on a regular basis (annually or quarterly, as appropriate) to assist the President and the administrative staff in determining Gadsden State's progress in achieving its institutional goals.

INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1 --Development of Academic, Occupational, Personal, Interpersonal Knowledge & Skills.

Educational Goal Attainment:

1.01 -- No./% of exiting students reporting that they achieved the educational goal(s) they established for themselves.[1]

1.02 -- No./% of degree-seeking students who master all competences required by their degree program.[2]

1.03 -- No./% of non-degree-seeking students mastering the competences of at least 80% of the courses they attempted.[3]

1.04 -- No./% of exiting students who would recommend GSJC to a friend or relative in a similar situation.[1]

Transfer Performance Indicators:

1.05 -- No. of exiting students transferring to a senior institution degree program within one year of leaving GSJC.[4]

1.06 -- No./% of transfer students who report no difficulty transferring credits.[4]

1.07 -- No./% of transfer students who report satisfaction with GSJC preparation at the end of the first year at the senior institution.[4]

1.08 -- No./% of transfer students in good academic standing (GPA 2.00 or higher) at the end of first term at senior institution.[4]

Occupational Performance Indicators:

1.09 -- No./% of exiting students passing certification or licensing examination (where applicable) within three attempts.[4]

1.10 -- No./% of exiting students securing a full-time job in major field within one year of leaving Gadsden State.[4]

1.11 -- No./% of full-time jobholders who report satisfaction with GSJC preparation after first year on the job.[4]

ORIGINATOR: A/President
DISTRIBUTION: W/All Planning Book Holders
SUBJECT: Inventory of Performance Indicators for Institutional Goals

	THIS	REPLACES
FILE:	50.001	50.001
DATE:	6/19/78	2/14/77
PAGE:	2 OF 2	2 OF 5

1.12 -- No./% of supervisors of jobholders who report satisfaction with Gadsden State's preparation of the jobholder after first year on the job.[5]

1.13 -- No./% of supervisors reporting willingness to employ GSJC graduates in similar positions if they should open up.[5]

INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2 --Individual Personal Development.

2.01 -- No./% of exiting students who, within two years of attendance at GSJC, are able to identify a set of personal goals, a long range career goal, the highest degree they plan to attain, the field of study of the highest degree, and the year in which they expect to attain it.[1]

INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3 --Other Community Development Activities.

3.01 -- No. of students, nonstudent residents participating each year in an activity sponsored by GSJC or located on the college campus.[1, 6]

Data Sources:

[1]Exiting Student Questionnaire
[2]Records from Office of Records
[3]Quarterly Grade Analysis
[4]Student Follow-up Questionnaire
[5]Employer Follow-up Questionnaire
[6]Community Services Office, Student Activities Office

ORIGINATOR: President ADIR

DISTRIBUTION: All Planning Book Holders

SUBJECT: Five Year Institutional Objectives (Routine)

PLANNING PROFILE

	THIS	REPLACES
FILE:	50.002	50.002
DATE:	1/8/79	4/17/78
PAGE:	1 OF 2	1-5 OF 5

	Performance Indicator	HISTORICAL FOURTH YR. 74-75	HISTORICAL THIRD YR. 75-76	HISTORICAL SECOND YR. 76-77	HISTORICAL LAST YR. 77-78	CURRENT YEAR 78-79	FUTURE NEXT YR. 79-80	FUTURE SECOND YR. 80-81	FUTURE THIRD YR. 81-82	FUTURE FOURTH YR. 82-83	FUTURE FIFTH YR. 83-84
1	Goal 1: Student Educational Development										
2	1.01-1.04 Educational Goal Attainment										
3	1.01 % of exiting students reporting achievement of goals				85	85	85	85	85	85	85
4											
5	1.02 % of degree seekers completing degree requirements		40	31	19	25	30	35	40	45	50
6											
7	1.03 % of all students passing 80% of courses attempted										
8											
9	1.04 % willing to recommend GSJC to others (probably or definitely)				90	90	90	90	90	90	90
10											
11	1.05-1.08 Transfer Performance Indicators										
12	1.05 % of higher-degree seekers admitted to higher degree prog.		32	62	41	41	41	41	41	41	41
13											
14	1.06 % of transfer students who report no difficulty in transferring credits				87	88	89	90	91	92	93
15											
16	1.07 % of transfer students at least fairly satisfied with GSJC preparation				91	91	91	91	91	91	91
17											
18	1.08 % of transfer students in good academic standing at senior institution				80	80	80	80	80	80	80
19											

Appendix 3

ORIGINATOR: President ADK
DISTRIBUTION: All Planning Book Holders
SUBJECT: Five-Year Institutional Objectives (Routine)

PLANNING PROFILE

	THIS	REPLACES
FILE:	50.002	50.002
DATE:	1/8/79	4/17/78
PAGE:	2 of 2	1-5 of 5

	Performance Indicators	HISTORICAL FOURTH YR. 74-75	HISTORICAL THIRD YR. 75-76	HISTORICAL SECOND YR. 76-77	HISTORICAL LAST YR. 77-78	CURRENT YEAR 78-79	FUTURE NEXT YR. 79-80	FUTURE SECOND YR. 80-81	FUTURE THIRD YR. 81-82	FUTURE FOURTH YR. 82-83	FUTURE FIFTH YR. 83-84
1	1.09-1.13 Occupational Performance Indicators										
2	1.09 % passing certification examination				84	85	86	87	88	89	90
3											
4	1.10 % getting job somewhat or directly related to major field				51	52	53	54	55	56	57
5											
6	1.11 % of jobholders at least fairly satisfied with GSJC preparation				81	81	81	81	81	81	81
7											
8	1.12 % of supervisors at least fairly satisfied with GSJC preparation					75	77	79	81	83	85
9											
10	1.13 % of supervisors willing to employ other GSJC graduates					75	77	79	81	83	85
11											
12	Goal 2: Student Personal Development										
13	2.01 % of students with educational and career plans		84	88		80	81	82	83	84	85
14											
15	Goal 3: Community Development										
16	3.01 % of students participating in college-sponsored event			11		20	25	30	35	40	45
17											
18	Total Attendance at College-Sponsored Events									40	
19											

Appendix 3

OPERATIONAL DATA

		THIS	REPLACES
ORIGINATOR: President	FILE:	51.001	51.001
DISTRIBUTION: All Planning Book Holders	DATE:	4/26/78	3/23/77
SUBJECT: Innovative & Problem Solving Objectives--College-wide, 1978-83	PAGE:	1 OF 1	1 OF 1

1. The Dean of Instruction will increase the present level of retention of students to program completion by 5% per year for the next 5 years, beginning in the fall, 1977, quarter.

2. The Dean of Students will implement an early registration system on a one-year trial basis effective July 1, 1977, so that effective the spring, 1978, quarter at least 80% of the student body will be registered 3 weeks before the beginning of the quarter.

3. By September, 1977, the Dean of Instruction, in coordination with the Dean of Students, will develop a system of early identification of and assistance to students who are undecided about their educational objectives so that effective the fall quarter, 1977, 85% of degree-seeking students will have identified a major field of study by the end of their first quarter at Gadsden State and 100% by the end of their second quarter.

4. The Director of Planning and Research, in coordination with the Career Development Center, will develop and implement an exiting student follow-up system so that, effective the fall quarter, 1977, follow-up information will be obtained from 75% of all students exiting from degree programs.

Appendix 5

EXITING STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

GADSDEN STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE

A message to the exiting student: The Exiting Student Questionnaire which you are about to complete is given to every student enrolled at Gadsden State shortly before the end of the final quarter in which he or she is enrolled. Your answers will help the faculty and administration of the College find out how well we are serving our students and how we might improve our services to future students. Federal law guarantees you complete confidentiality. The information obtained on this questionnaire will be used only for confidential individual counseling and in summary form for statistical purposes. After the information is recorded, all questionnaires will be destroyed. Thank you for taking the time to fill out the questionnaire accurately and completely.

John A. Bers
Director of Planning & Research

GADSDEN STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE
EXITING STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Name _____
Last First Middle Initial

2. Social Security No. (Student I.D.)

2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Quarter _____ (11) Year _____ (12-13)

3. When did you first enter Gadsden State to begin working in your current program?

Qtr. _____ (14) Yr. _____ (15-16)

4. What is your major field of study?

_____

For Office Use Only

17	18	19	20

5. What are your immediate educational plans?

21 _____(1) Completing a degree or certificate this quarter
_____(2) Leaving Gadsden State at the end of the quarter without a degree or certificate.
_____(3) Planning to continue your educational program at Gadsden State within a year.

6. What kind of career do you expect to have in the long run?

_____

For Office Use Only

22	23	24	25

7. What is the highest degree or certificate you eventually intend to complete?

_____

For Office Use Only

26	27

8. In what field of study do you plan to major in the above degree program?

_____

For Office Use Only

28	29	30	31

Office Use Only
Campus Center

32

Did Gadsden State help you in reaching each of the goals listed below? (If a statement was not a goal of yours, check only the first column.)

		On the whole, I feel that I achieved this goal. 2	On the whole, I feel I did not achieve this goal. 1	This was not a goal of mine. 0
9. To complete courses necessary to transfer to a four-year college.	33	☐	☐	☐
10. To discover my vocational interest.	34	☐	☐	☐
11. To prepare for a new career	35	☐	☐	☐
12. To improve my knowledge and technical skills required in my present job	36	☐	☐	☐
13. To increase my chances for a possible raise and/or possible promotion in my present job	37	☐	☐	☐
14. To learn skills that will enrich my personal life	38	☐	☐	☐
15. To improve my ability to get along with people	39	☐	☐	☐

How often have you taken part in each of the following activities or services while enrolled at Gadsden State?

		At Least Daily 5	At Least Once a Week 4	At Least Once a Month 3	Once or Twice a Quarter 2	Once or Twice 1	Never 0
College Services							
16. A conference with your faculty advisor about your educational progress and plans.	40	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. The Career Development Center	41	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. The Counselors in the Student Center	42	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. The Learning Resources Center (LRC)	43	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. The College Cafeteria or Snack Bar	44	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. The College Bookstore	45	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. One of the College buses (for transportation to and from Gadsden State)	46	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

		At Least Daily 5	At Least Once a Week 4	At Least Once a Month 3	Once or Twice a Quarter 2	Once or Twice 1	Never 0
College-Sponsored Extra-Curricular Activities							
23. Student government meeting	47	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24. Intramural athletics	48	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
25. Intercollegiate athletics (as a participant)	49	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
26. Intercollegiate athletics (as a spectator)	50	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
27. College-sponsored Club	51	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
28. A student publication (such as The Courier or Coosada)	52	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
29. A college-sponsored cultural or entertainment event (a concert, dance, play, speaker, etc.)	53	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
30. Listening to the College Radio Station (WEXP)	54	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Community Activities							
31. Civic or charitable organization. (Name of organization: _____)	55	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
32. Performing (as in plays, orchestras) (Name of Group: _____)	56	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

How satisfied are you with each of the following aspects of Gadsden State's programs and services? (If you have not used a service, please check only the first column.)

		Very Satisfied 4	Somewhat Satisfied 3	Dissatisfied 2	This Service Not Available 1	Never Used this Service 0
33. My overall impression of Gadsden State	11	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Instruction						
34. The overall quality of instruction	12	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
35. Availability of needed courses	13	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
36. Convenience of times courses were offered	14	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
37. The accessibility of instructors	15	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
38. Reading, writing, math skills improvements	16	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Academic Advisement — How satisfied are you with advisement you received about—						
39. Course requirements and electives for a Gadsden State degree in your major field of study.	17	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
40. Academic requirements of transfer institutions in your major field.	18	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
41. Career opportunities, job openings, and job entry requirements in your major field.	19	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Student Services						
42. Admissions Office	20	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
43. Registration	21	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
44. Financial Aid Office	22	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
45. Student Employment Services while attending college	23	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
46. Job Placement Office after college	24	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
47. Guidance and Counseling Services	25	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
48. Career Development Center	26	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
49. Recreation and athletic programs	27	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
50. Infirmary	28	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
51. Dormitory	29	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
52. College cultural & entertainment programs	30	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Learning Resources Center (LRC)						
53. Availability of books, other materials needed for course work	31	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
54. Assistance provided by LRC staff	32	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Continued on reverse side

		Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Dissatisfied	This Service Not Available	Never Used this Service
		0	1	2	3	4
College Cafeteria & Snack Bar						
55. Variety of dishes	33	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
56. Speed of service	34	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
57. Convenience of hours	35	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
58. Atmosphere of Cafeteria	36	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
College Bookstore						
59. Reasonable price	37	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
60. Availability of item(s) needed for class work	38	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
61. Speed of service	39	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
62. Assistance provided by Bookstore staff	40	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Campus Security						
63. Your personal safety	41	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
64. The security of your personal property	42	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
65. Security of your car while parked on college property	43	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
66. Traffic safety on college property	44	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
College Bus Service						
67. Accessibility of bus stop from your home	45	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
68. Convenience of bus schedule to your academic schedule	46	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

69. Check the reason or reasons why you are leaving Gadsden State at this time.

Academic:

- ___(A) Completed program
- ___(B) Transferred to another College or University
- ___(C) Low grades
- ___(D) Found courses too difficult
- ___(E) Inadequate study techniques or habits
- ___(F) Needed a temporary break from studies
- ___(G) Major or courses not available at this school
- ___(H) Unsure of major and needed to leave school to decide on possible career
- ___(I) Course work not challenging
- ___(J) Learned what I came to learn
- ___(K) Dissatisfaction with major department
- ___(L) Dissatisfied with quality of teaching

Financial:

- ___(M) Not enough money to go to this school
- ___(N) Applied but could not obtain enough financial aid
- ___(O) Child care not available or too costly

Employment

- ___(P) Scheduling conflict between job and studies
- ___(Q) Accepted a job and did not need more school
- ___(R) Went into military service
- ___(S) Could not find a job while in college

Personal Circumstances:

- ___(T) Found study too time consuming
- ___(U) Home responsibilities were too great
- ___(V) Illness, personal or family
- ___(W) Personal problems
- ___(X) Fullfilled my personal goals in schooling
- ___(Y) Marital situation changed my education plans
- ___(Z) Moved out of the area
- ___(AA) Could not get transportation to the college
- ___(BB) Other: Describe _____

_____

Looking at the above list in question 69, please select the three most important reasons why you are leaving Gadsden State and write their letters in the boxes below.

70. First ☐ (47-48) **71. Second** ☐ (49-50) **72. Third** ☐ (51-52)

73. In reflecting upon your experience in your program at Gadsden State, would you recommend it to a friend or relative who is in a situation similar to yours?

53
- ___(1) Definitely Not
- ___(2) Probably Not
- ___(3) Probably Yes
- ___(4) Definitely Yes

74. 54 ☐ Check here if you would like to receive a summary report of this survey.

75. Suggestions or comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thanks again for your cooperation. Best of luck in your future endeavors.

Contra Costa Junior College

PROJECT FOLLOW-UP

Please make corrections to the information above if necessary.

EMPLOYEE'S NAME _____ STUDENT NUMBER

JOB TITLE _____

PROGRAM MAJOR _____ SCHOOL _____

EMPLOYER (COMPANY NAME - INSTITUTION - ORGANIZATION, ETC.)

1 Is the job title and status of the above employee accurate?

24- 1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No; IF NO, please describe change(s) below.

2 What is your relationship with the above employee?

25- 1 ☐ Employer
26- 1 ☐ Supervisor
27- 1 ☐ Personnel staff
28- 1 ☐ Co-worker
29- 1 ☐ Other (describe) _____

OVER PLEASE!

3 Please rate the qualifications of the employee in the following personal skill areas. Please respond only to those areas you feel are appropriate.

	Very Good	Good	Neutral	Poor	Very Poor
a. Accepting responsibility 40					
b. Punctuality 41					
c. Personal initiative 42					
d. Willingness to learn 43					
e. Co-worker cooperation 44					
f. Management cooperation 45					
g. Work attendance 46					
h. Work attitude 47					
i. Personal appearance 48					
j. Compliance with policies 49					

4 Please rate the qualifications of the employee in the following technical skill areas. Please respond only to those areas you feel are applicable to the occupational area.

	Very Good	Good	Neutral	Poor	Very Poor
a. Mathematical skills 50					
b. Technical knowledge 51					
c. Organizational ability 52					
d. Communication skills 53					
e. Problem solving skills 54					
f. Work quality 55					
g. Work quantity 56					
h. Manual dexterity 57					
i. Meeting the public 58					
j. Following instructions 59					
k. Operation of equipment 60					

5 What is your overall rating of the training received by the employee as it relates to the requirements of his or her job?

61
1. Very good
2. Good
3. Neutral
4. Poor
5. Very poor

6 Then, in your opinion, is the job outlook for employees in this particular occupational field?

62
1. Very good
2. Good
3. Neutral
4. Poor
5. Very poor

7 As a result of the employee's training, how would you rate his or her preparation in relation to other employees without such training?

63
1. No basis for opinion
2. Employee is better prepared
3. Both are about the same
4. Employee is less prepared

8 To what extent, if any, has the employee's training added to his or her skills for job placement and advancement?

64
1. Very much
2. Much
3. Neutral
4. Very little
5. None

9 What was the primary source(s) for the initial hiring of the employee named?

65
1. Employment agency
2. School faculty member
3. School job placement office
4. Personal acquaintances
5. Applicant applied on own initiative
6. Other (describe)

A What suggestions do you have for improving the technical and/or personal skills of future employees?

B What, in your opinion, are additional areas of training (job titles, skills, etc.) in which our school should become involved?

END

THANK YOU FOR ASSISTING US IN OUR SURVEY! PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM IN THE PRE-PAID ENVELOPE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE!

Appendix 6

STUDENT FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

GADSDEN STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE

A message to the former student: The Student Follow-Up Questionnaire which you are about to complete is sent to former students of Gadsden State within a year after the last quarter in which they were enrolled. The College seeks your frank opinions about the College as well as information about your educational and career progress since your association with us. This information will be of great help to the faculty and administration in finding out how well we have served our students and how we might improve our services to future students. **Federal law guarantees you complete confidentiality.** The information obtained on this questionnaire will be used only in summary form for statistical purposes. After the information is recorded, all questionnaires will be destroyed. Thank you for taking a few minutes to fill out the questionnaire accurately and completely.

John A. Bers
Director of Planning & Research

GADSDEN STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE
Student Follow-up Questionnaire

1. Which one of the following describes your status when you left Gadsden State? (Check One)

11
- 1 ☐ I did not receive a degree or certificate from this college
- 2 ☐ Certificate of less than one year
- 3 ☐ Certificate of one year or more
- 4 ☐ Associate degree

2. Please write in what your major/program was when you graduated or left Gadsden State.

_____

For Office Use			
12	13	14	15

3. In reflecting upon your experience in your program at Gadsden State, would you recommend it to a friend or relative who is in a situation similar to yours?

16
- 1 ☐ Yes
- 2 ☐ No

4. Have you taken any employment licensing or certification examinations since leaving Gadsden State? (Check One)

17
- 1 ☐ No, I have not taken any exams
- 2 ☐ Yes, I have taken an exam and passed
- 3 ☐ Yes, I have taken an exam, but I did not pass
- 4 ☐ Yes, I have taken an exam, but I do not know the results yet

5. Have you enrolled in a degree program since you left Gadsden State? (Check One)

18
- 1 ☐ Yes, but I am no longer enrolled (GO TO QUESTION 6)
- 2 ☐ Yes, and I am still enrolled (GO TO QUESTION 6)
- 3 ☐ No, I have not enrolled in a degree program (SKIP TO QUESTION 15)

If you answered YES, please complete questions 6-14 about the first college you attended since graduating from our school. If you answered NO, skip to question 15.

6. What is the name and location of the first college or university you attended since leaving Gadsden State?

(NAME) (STATE)

7. Please write in your major/program while attending the above college or university.

For Office Use

College						Major			
19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28

8. To what extent is your current field of study related to the major/program you were enrolled in at our college? (Check One)

29
- 1 ☐ Current field of study is not related to my major/program
- 2 ☐ Current field of study is somewhat related to my major/program
- 3 ☐ Current field of study is specifically related to my major/program

9. If your current field of study is unrelated to your major/program at GSJC, for what reason did you leave that field of study? (Check One)

30
- 1 ☐ Did not feel my GSJC preparation was adequate for further study in that field
- 2 ☐ Was no longer interested in that field of study
- 3 ☐ Became more interested in another field of study
- 4 ☐ Was unable to find a program of further education in that field of study
- 5 ☐ Other (Please explain): _____

52 _____

10. What degree were you seeking at this new college or university? (Check One)

31
- 1 ☐ Associate Degree
- 2 ☐ Bachelor's Degree
- 3 ☐ Master's Degree
- 4 ☐ Professional Degree (includes only dentistry, medicine, optometry, osteopathy, podiatry, veterinary medicine, law and theology)
- 5 ☐ Doctor's Degree (e.g., PH.D., Ed.D., D.B.A.)

11. How well did Gadsden State prepare you for this new college/university program? (Check One)

32
- 1 ☐ Inadequate Preparation
- 2 ☐ Fair Preparation
- 3 ☐ Good Preparation

12. Did you have any difficulty in transferring when you enrolled for this new college/university program? (Check One)

33
- 1 ☐ No, I did not experience difficulty in transferring
- 2 ☐ Yes, I experienced difficulty in transferring. Please briefly indicate the nature of the difficulty.

_____

_____

13. List below any GSJC courses <u>not</u> accepted for transfer.

For Office Use

_____ | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 |

_____ | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 |

_____ | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 |

14. What was your first term grade point average at this new college or university?

52
- 1 ☐ Less than 2.0
- 2 ☐ 2.0 to 2.5
- 3 ☐ 2.6 to 3.0
- 4 ☐ 3.1 to 3.5
- 5 ☐ 3.6 to 4.0
- 6 ☐ Don't Know

15. If you are planning to continue your education, what is your goal? (Check One)

53
- 1 ☐ Do not plan to complete a degree or certificate
- 2 ☐ Certificate
- 3 ☐ Diploma (other than those listed below)
- 4 ☐ Associate Degree
- 5 ☐ Bachelor's Degree
- 6 ☐ Master's Degree
- 7 ☐ Professional Degree (includes only dentistry, medicine, optometry, osteopathy, podiatry, veterinary medicine, law and theology)
- 8 ☐ Doctor's Degree (e.g., Ph.D., Ed.D., D.B.A.)

16. Are you interested in taking other courses at Gadsden State? You may include courses not presently offered by our college. (Check One)

54
- 1 ☐ No
- 2 ☐ Yes: What course(s) _____

_____

17. Are you currently employed? (Check One)

55
- 1 ☐ Employed full-time (35 or more hours per week)
- 2 ☐ Employed part-time (a minimum of 15 hours per week)
- 3 ☐ Unemployed and seeking employment
- 4 ☐ Homemaker, not employed outside home
- 5 ☐ Not employed and not seeking employment
- 6 ☐ Full-time student

If you are employed, either full-time or part-time, please complete the following questions about your employment since leaving Gadsden State.

18. Please write in the space below what your current job is: (For example: nurse, welder, secretary, insurance salesman)

For Office Use

_____ | 56 | 57 | 58 |

19. What was the educational requirement for your present position? (Check One)

59
- 1 ☐ No educational requirement
- 2 ☐ High school graduate
- 3 ☐ Post high school certificate
- 4 ☐ Associate Degree
- 5 ☐ Bachelor's Degree
- 6 ☐ Other (Specify): _____

53

20. How long after leaving our college did it take you to find your current job? (Check One)

60
- 1 ☐ I had the job before enrolling at GSJC
- 2 ☐ I found the job bef_re leaving GSJC
- 3 ☐ 2 months or less
- 4 ☐ 3 to 6 months
- 5 ☐ 7 months to 1 year
- 6 ☐ Over 1 year

21. How well do you feel our college prepared you for your current job? (Check One)

61
- ☐ Inadequate preparation
- 2 ☐ Fair preparation
- 3 ☐ Good preparation

22. Which statement best describes how you regard your current full-time job? (Check One)

62
- 1 ☐ Employment with definite career potential
- 2 ☐ Employment with possible career potential
- 3 ☐ Employment to earn money while I decide what kind of work I want
- 4 ☐ Temporary employment to earn money to do something else (travel, school, have free time, etc.)
- 5 ☐ Temporary employment until I can find a job in my field
- 6 ☐ Temporary employment until I can find something better

23. How did you learn of this job? (Check primary source)

63
- 1 ☐ Was already working in it while enrolled
- 2 ☐ College placement office
- 3 ☐ Professional organization or journal
- 4 ☐ Public or private employment agency
- 5 ☐ Newspaper advertisement
- 6 ☐ Direct application to employer
- 7 ☐ Faculty referral
- 8 ☐ Referral through friend or relative
- 9 ☐ Other (please specify) _____

24. If your job is full-time, what is the annual salary or wage? $_____ per year.

For Office Use ☐ 64

The information in question 25 is requested so that GSJC can conduct a confidential survey of employers of former students to learn their views about how we can improve our programs. Their responses will be kept confidential and will be used only in summary form for statistical purposes.

25. a. Name of your immediate supervisor _____ (65-80)

b His/her title. _____ (11-28)

c Company Name: _____ (29-46)

d Company Address: _____ (No. 47-64 Street)

_____ (City 65-75 State 76-77 Zip 11-19)

26. To what extent is your current job related to the major/program you were enrolled in at our college? (Check One)

20
- 1 ☐ Current job is not related to my major/program
- 2 ☐ Current job is somewhat related to my major/program
- 3 ☐ Current job is specifically what I was trained for in my major/program

If your current job is not related to your major/program, please answer questions 27-28 to help us better understand why not.

27. Please check from the list below the principal reason why your current job is not in your major/program.

21
- 1 ☐ I never looked for a job related to my major/program
- 2 ☐ I looked, but could not find a job related to my major/program without moving out of the geographic area
- 3 ☐ I looked, but could not find a job related to my major/program even in other geographic areas
- 4 ☐ I have held a job related to my major/program, but decided to get into a new employment field

28. Are you willing to move to another community to get a job in the field for which you were trained? (Check One)

22
- 1 ☐ Yes
- 2 ☐ No

Suggestions or Comments: _____

Thanks again for your cooperation. Gadsden State wishes you the best of luck either on the job or in your further educational pursuits.

Please make corrections to the information on address label if necessary.

Gadsden State Junior College
GEORGE WALLACE DRIVE • GADSDEN, ALABAMA 35903

September 15, 1978

Gadsden State is participating in what we consider to be one of the most important and worthwhile joint ventures between local educational institutions and industry in our memory: a follow-up survey of local students who have been employed by business and industry in our area. You may already have heard about this project through the news media.

As the supervisor of one of our former students, you are in an excellent position to evaluate the education and training received by this student. This letter is to invite your participation in this project. Would you kindly take just five minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire concerning the training received by this former student, even if he or she no longer works for you or your organization, and return it in the enclosed, self-addressed, postage-paid envelope within five days. Your responses will in no way affect the employee and will be kept in strict confidence.

The information which you provide will be summarized and analyzed to help us to find out how well Gadsden State is preparing its students for employment, to determine the needs of area employers for particular knowledge, skills, and attitudes in their employees, and to learn how we can make our programs more responsive to the education and training needs of business and industry.

In order for the results to be valid and meaningful, we need as large a participation by supervisors as possible. Your own participation is extremely important to us.

Many thanks for helping us to improve the education and training of our young people.

Sincerely,

Allan D. Naylor
President

ADN/sp

Postage Will Be Paid by Addressee

No Postage Stamp Necessary If Mailed in the United States

BUSINESS REPLY ENVELOPE

First Class Permit No. 145, Gadsden, Alabama

GADSDEN STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE

100 GEORGE WALLACE DRIVE

GADSDEN, ALABAMA 35903

ATTN.:
DIRECTOR OF PLANNING & RESEARCH

RE: Employer Follow-up Survey of Local Students

Dear Employer:

Recently a questionnaire was mailed to you asking for your opinion of the training received by a former student of Gadsden State. Please make every effort to complete this questionnaire and return it to Gadsden State as soon as possible. Many thanks for helping us to improve the education and training of our young people.

Allen D. Naylor
President

Gadsden State Junior College
GEORGE WALLACE DRIVE • GADSDEN, ALABAMA 35903

October 9, 1978

On September 15th, I asked if you would join us in what we consider to be one of the most important and worthwhile joint ventures between local educational institutions and industry in our memory: a follow-up survey of local students who have been employed by business and industry in our area. As the supervisor of one of our former students you are in an excellent position to evaluate the education and training received by the student named on the enclosed questionnaire.

As we have not received the completed questionnaire from you, we are sending a duplicate in hopes that you will take the five minutes necessary to answer the questions concerning the training received by this former student, even if he or she no longer works for you or your organization, and return it in the enclosed self-addressed, postage-paid envelope within five days. Your responses will in no way affect the employee and will be kept in strict confidence.

The information which you provide will be summarized and anlyzed to help us find out how well Gadsden State is preparing its students for employment, to determine the needs of area employers for particular knowledge, skills, and attitudes in their employees, and to learn how we can make our programs more responsive to the education and training needs of business and industry.

As I mentioned in my earlier letter to you, in order for the results to be valid and meaningful, we need as large a participation by supervisors as possible. Your own participation is extremely important to us.

Again, many thanks for helping us to improve the education and training of our young people.

Sincerely,

Allan D. Naylor

Allan D. Naylor
President

Gadsden State Junior College
GEORGE WALLACE DRIVE • GADSDEN, ALABAMA 35903

Thank you for completing the Employer Follow-Up Survey regarding a former Gadsden State student who is employed by you or your business. The information which you reported will be valuable for future program evaluation and development. If you desire more specific information regarding the final report, please contact me at your convenience. Again, many thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Allan D. Naylor
President

ADN/sp

Receptionist 237
Secretary 201

Goodyear (Tire Builder) 750
Goodyear (Supervisor) 750

Nurse 075
Nurse Aid 355
L.P.N. 070
Supervisor 075

Clerk General 209
Clerk-Stenographer 202
Clerk-Typist 203
General Office Clerk 219

Cashier 211

Teacher Secondary Ed. 091
Teacher's Aid 099
Police Chief 375
Police Officer 375

Army 378

Real Estate 250

Engineering 007

Broadcasting
Radio Announcer 159
Television Announcer 159

Counselor 045

Accountant 160

MLT 078
EMT 079
Court Reporter 202

Computer Operator 213
Computer 018

Bookeeper 210

Fireman 373

Salesperson-General 279

Waitress 311

Cashier 211

University of Alabama	001051
Jacksonville	001020
Auburn	001009
UAB	001052
UAH	001055
Jefferson St.	001022
Samford	001036
Montevallo	001004
Snead State	001038

(1) Less than $3,000 per year ($1.44 or less)

(2) $3,000-$5,999 per year ($1.45-$2.88)

(3) $6,000-$7,499 per year ($2.89-$3.60)

(4) $7,500-$9,999 per year ($3.61-$4.80)

(5) $10,000-$14,999 per year ($4.81-$7.21)

(6) $15,000-$24,999 per year (7.22-$12.01)

(7) $25,000 and above per year ($12.02 or more)

Alabama Technical College	000001
Gadsden Business College	000002
Gadsden State Technical Institute	000003
Holy Name of Jesus Hospital--Nursing Program	000004
Ayers Technical College	000005
Regional Technical Institute (RTI)	000006
Other Alabama technical or proprietary institutions	000007
Technical or proprietary institutions outside Alabama	000008

Gadsden State Junior College
GEORGE WALLACE DRIVE • GADSDEN, ALABAMA 35903

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Douglas Ponder

FROM: John A. Bers

DATE: September 20, 1978

RE: Data Processing Requirements for Student Questionnaires

Doug, this memorandum is in response to your request yesterday that I put down in writing my specific data processing requirements for the various questionnaires that have been administered in the past two years.

DATA BASE CONTENTS

Table 1 below describes the student data base which I would like to work from. Each box contains a number which refers to a note indicating the current status of the data as well as the desired status.

Table 1

Cohort[1]	Student Master Data	Exiting Student Questionnaire	Student Follow-Up Questionnaire	Employer Follow-Up Questionnaire
1976-77 Exiters	2	3	4	5
1977-78 Exiters	6	7	8	9

[1]A cohort for a given academic year is defined as all of the students who enrolled for credit-bearing course work during that academic year and did not re-enroll for the following Fall Quarter.

[2]The Student Master data for the 1976-77 cohorts should include the entire cohort population. The present tape contains only the student master cards of those who responded to one or the other of the questionnaires. A problem that will have to be worked out here is that one cannot determine which cohort a student belongs to from the Student Master card itself. Somehow the Student Masters will have to be labeled in order to be placed into the correct cohort.

[3]Exiting Student Questionnaire data for 1976-77 cohort were collected using an earlier version of the Exiting Student Questionnaire and are not presently on the tape. It will be necessary to recode this data into the format of the current version of the Exiting Student Questionnaire. This should be a very simple matter if SPSS is used,and I will be happy to assist you in this task.

[4]Student Follow-up Questionnaire data for the 1976-77 cohort are presently on the tape and appear to be in satisfactory condition.

[5]Employer Follow-up Questionnaire data for the 1976-77 cohorts are presently being collected by the Office of Planning and Research and will be provided to the Computer Center for inclusion in the data base by approximately January 1, 1979.

[6]Student master card data for the 1977-78 cohort should include the entire cohort population rather than just those who responded to a questionnaire. Now that Fall, 1978, registration is about finished, it will be possible to define and include in the tape the entire cohort population.

[7]Exiting Student Questionnaire data for the 1977-78 cohort is presently included on the tape. There is one problem with this data as it was entered, however: the keypunch operator in the Computer Center punched a "zero" into all locations in which there was no response. However, questions 9 through 68 contain a "zero" as one of the response choices. If the zero is left in for missing values, the result will be to overstate the number of people who have responded to the zero response choice on the questionnaire, therefore invalidating the results. It will be necessary to repunch missing values using a value other than those assigned to the response choices.

[8]Student Follow-up data for the 1977-78 cohort will be obtained by the Office of Planning and Research during the current year and provided to the Computer Center by approximately February 1, 1979.

[9]Employer Follow-up data for the 1977-78 cohorts will be collected by the Office of Planning and Research and provided to the Computer Center by approximately May 1, 1979.

OUTPUT REQUIREMENTS

Summary

1. Frequency Distributions. Include both amounts and percentages, for both cohorts on the following items: Student Master data columns 70-74, 85-86; Exiting Student Questionnaire questions 5, 9 thru 68, and 70 thru 73; Student Follow-up Questionnaire questions 8, 12, 13, and 16 thru 31. In order to be included in the frequency distribution, the following values will have to be recoded and/or recomputed:

Mr. Doug Ponder
September 20
Page 3

(a) Birth year (Student Master columns 72-73) should be recomputed into age. For the 1976-77 cohort age equals 77 minus year of birth while for the 1977-78 cohort age equals 78 minus year of birth. The age values should then be temporarily recoded (for frequency distribution runs only) as follows: lowest through 17 set equal to 1, 18 thru 20 set equal to 2, 21 thru 45 set equal to 3, 46 thru 64 set equal to 4, 65 thru highest set equal to 5. Value labels for age should be as follows: 1--pre-college age, 2--college age, 3--young adults, 4--mature adults, 5--senior citizens.

(b) A quality point average (QPA) should be computed from quality points (Student Master columns 82-84) and hours attempted (Student Master columns 76-78) according to the following formula: QPA = quality points ÷ hours attempted.

(c) Exiting Student Questionnaire question 6 and Follow-up Questionnaire question 23 should be recoded as follows: 000 thru 199 set equal to 1, 200 thru 299 set equal to 2, 300 thru 399 set equal to 3, 400 thru 499 set equal to 4, 500 thru 599 set equal to 5, 600 thru 699 set equal to 6, 700 thru 799 equal to 7, 800 thru 899 set equal to 8, 900 thru 999 set equal to 9. Value labels for these recoded values should be as follows: 1--professional, technical, and managerial; 2--clerical and sales; 3--service; 4--agricultural, fishery, forestry; 5--processing; 6--machine trades; 7--benchwork; 8--structural work; 9--miscellaneous.

(d) Exiting Student Questionnaire questions 16 thru 32 should be recoded as follows: set response choice 2 equal to 4, response choice 3 equal to 14, response 4 equal to 45, and response choice 5 equal to 153.

(e) Follow-up Questionnaire question 19 should be recoded as follows: set 1 equal to 1.5, set 2 equal to 2.25, set 3 equal to 2.75, set 4 equal to 3.25, set 5 equal to 3.75, set 6 equal to MV.

(f) Follow-up Questionnaire question 27 should be recoded as follows: set 1 equal to 1500, 2 equal to 4500, 3 equal to 6750, 4 equal 8250, 5 equal to 12,500, 6 equal to 20,000, 7 equal to 30,000.

2. Response Bias Analysis. A set of cross tabulations in which the row variables are the student master card data requested above and the column variables are (1) questionnaire respondents and (2) the total cohort population. A separate crosstab should be run for 1976-77 cohorts who responded to the Exiting Student Questionnaire, 1976-77 cohorts who responded to the Student Follow-up Questionnaire, and 1977-78 cohorts who responded to the Exiting Student Questionnaire.

Mr. Doug Ponder
September 20, 1978
Page 4

3. Sub-group Frequency Distributions. A separate frequency distribution on the same data as covered in Run 1 above should be run for each major field of study (Exiting Student Questionnaire question 4), for each division at the college (divisions are defined as groupings of major fields of study and will require recoding), and for transfer versus career students (Student Master card column 74).

4. Means and Standard Deviations. Should be obtained for the runs described in items 1 and 3 for the following variables:

(a) Age (as recoded from year of birth, Student Master columns 72-73);

(b) Hours Attempted (Student Master columns 76-78);

(c) Hours Earned (Student Master columns 79-81);

(d) Quality point average (as recoded--see above);

(e) Exiting Student Questionnaire questions 16-32 (as recoded--see above);

(f) Follow-up Questionnaire question 19 (as recoded--see above);

(g) Follow-up Questionnaire question 27 (as recoded--see above);

Doug, I see no reason for me to personally accompany you or your staff to Jacksonville to carry out these runs, as I am afraid I would only get in the way. However, please do not hesitate to call me for any assistance or clarification that I can offer.

DATES OUTPUT REQUIRED

Run 1.	Summary Frequency Distributions	Sept. 27, 1978
Run 2.	Response Bias Analysis	Oct. 4, 1978
Run 3.	Sub-groupd Frequency Distributions	Oct. 11, 1978
Run 4.	Means and Standard Deviations	Oct. 18, 1978

ORIGINATOR: B/Director of Planning & Research
DISTRIBUTION: Z/Chairperson, Division of Business
SUBJECT: Summary of Pertinent Comments by Employers of Former Business Majors

	THIS	REPLACES
FILE:	103.112	
DATE:	1/26/79	
PAGE:	1 OF 1	OF

Business Administration

Employer of receptionist: No suggestions for improvement at this point; XXX was an excellent employee.

Supervisor of trades helper in nearby army depot: Notes that a much needed area today for effective and efficient operation is good communications. Notes that the business program at Gadsden State is excellent. However, one area missing is more study of the psychological side and human relations side of business.

Supervisor of cutting room foreman at out-of-state manufacturing plant: "Business skill, management, and training programs should have a combined system of study with application. Several times study without application in a training program can result in a return to the books for information. As the old saying goes, 'Experience is the best teacher.'" Suggests that the college offer a program for young people which will demonstrate that no matter what one's age etc., he or she can operate a constructive business on his own.

Supervisor of accounts payable clerk at nearby retail company: "On the job training is the best teacher. It is impossible to fully train a person from a textbook." Suggests adding customer communication--written, phone, in-person--to the program.

Supervisor of a shipping clerk at a nearby firm: "A course in letter writing should be required in all business associate degrees...GSJC appears to have a good program."

Supervisor of real estate sales associate in nearby realty company: Suggests continuing education courses to keep employee's training up-to-date. "The courses you offer are ample, but I do feel that your instructors should spend the full two hours in the classroom so that the students may learn more."

Real Estate

Supervisor of secretary in local veterans affairs office: "Ms. XXX's present position of secretary in the Dept. of Veteran Affairs does not relate to a great extent to that of a real estate salesman although due to home loans being a part of the V.A. program, this course has contributed considerable knowledge in the field of home loans, various lending agencies, etc. in the realm of real estate... think they have a very good program at the present for all ages and walks of employment."

Supervisor of realty firm who attended GSJC: "You should hold a five-day seminar once a year to bring students up-to-date on laws and new techniques in the field.

Secretarial Science

Supervisor of secretary at local educational institution: Suggests "a greater emphasis on English grammar (both written and spoken), punctuation, vocabulary, sentence, and spelling. ...Instead of adding programs, existing programs should be evaluated for need and, if justified, upgraded."

Supervisor of secretary in local service center: Suggests training doing business with the public by phone.

57

GADSDEN STATE'S EMERGING ROLE:

A COMMUNITY-WIDE POSTSECONDARY EDUCATIONAL RESOURCE

Institutional Study #79-1

Gadsden State Junior College
Office of Planning and Research
John A. Bers, Director

January 26, 1979

GADSDEN STATE'S EMERGING ROLE: A COMMUNITY-WIDE POSTSECONDARY EDUCATIONAL RESOURCE

Highlights

A series of student and employer surveys administered by the Office of Planning and Research, together with data furnished by the Registrar's Office, suggest that Gadsden State's clientele regard the College in a rather different light from the picture presented by the College Catalog and other official publications.

The surveys were conducted between 1976 and 1978 to determine the extent to which the College and its programs and services are achieving their stated goals and objectives and to learn where improvements should be made.

What emerges from these studies is a student body that simply does not fit traditional junior college categories. Rather, Gadsden State's students resemble the "new" community college students across the country. Many of the students are following the national trend away from the traditional "lock-step" of two or four consecutive years of college and toward greater integration of education and work. Seventy percent are age twenty-one or older. Forty-three percent hold a full-time job while enrolled, while fully 88% were either working at or looking for a full-time job within a year after their last quarter. They are strongly oriented to their community and their current jobs. Their jobs pay reasonably well--half make over ten thousand dollars per year at their jobs--and a majority are unwilling to leave their community to get a job that is more closely related to their field of study.

They use Gadsden State as an educational resource on an intermittent basis to advance their long-range career or personal development as the constraints of job, family, funds, and other commitments permit--while only 10%

formally graduate with an associate's degree (fairly typical of the nation), over half (54%) of those who have exited plan to return to the College in a future quarter. A large number do not conform to the traditional concept of the transfer, career, or continuing education student. Thirty percent of those enrolled in career education programs enroll in a baccalaureate program within a year after leaving the College and another 23% intend to complete a bachelor's ultimately. Conversely, 42% of those enrolled in transfer programs held a full-time job within a year of leaving, while another 31% were looking for one.

They are by and large moderately, but not highly satisfied with the preparation that Gadsden State has given them for work or further education. Between 80 and 90% felt they had achieved the educational goals they had set for themselves while enrolled at the College. Those who transferred to a senior institution experienced little or no difficulty in getting their Gadsden State credits accepted and they performed about as well academically at the transfer institution as the average junior college transfer student. Half of those holding jobs and nearly half (46%) of those who transferred considered their GSJC preparation good.

Employers of former GSJC students had a slightly different perspective on the preparation their employees received at the College. A third rated their employees' overall preparation very good and another half rated it good. A substantial majority (77%) of employers were moderately or very satisfied with the former students' technical and personal skills. A substantial number of employers felt that the College could improve the education of its students in such generalized skill areas as problem-solving, communication, and human relations.

The detailed results of these studies have been reported to program administrators to help them ascertain the quality of their programs and where they can make improvements. In addition, a more in-depth analysis of the survey results was prepared by the Office of Planning and Research for distribution to the College's professional staff.

The survey results strongly suggest that Gadsden State is on the right track for meeting the needs of the large numbers of working adults who are now enrolling. Year-round instruction, evening courses, off-campus centers, flexible entry and exit policies, and a variety of supportive programs and services combine to make postsecondary study accessible to working adults that otherwise might be beyond their reach. However, the College cannot rest on its laurels. It must continue to "retool" existing programs and services to make them still more responsive to the needs of its new clientele.

Detailed Analysis and Policy Implications

I. The Exiting Student Questionnaire.

The Exiting Student Questionnaire, administered to students shortly before they leave the College (whether or not they plan to return at some time in the future), is intended to find out whether they have attained their educational goals, why they are leaving, and how satisfied they are with the College and its programs and services. Of all the surveys, this one had the lowest response rate (554 out of 2900 1977-78 exiters or about 20%), but the results are of interest nonetheless.

Goal Attainment--Although only about 10-15% of exiting students are formally awarded a degree, between 80 and 90% reported that they had completed their educational goal or goals. Most had multiple goals; 71% wanted to complete courses necessary to transfer to another institution; a surprising 70% wanted to enrich their personal life; 66% wanted to prepare for a new career; and 65% wanted to improve their human relations skills.

Reason for Leaving--The most widely reported reason for leaving (other than completing their program) was to transfer to another college (33%), followed by a wide variety of personal, employment, and academic reasons. A surprising number simply wanted to take a temporary break from their studies. Several had schedule conflicts between work and their studies.

Satisfaction with College--Exiting students' satisfaction with the College overall was moderately high; 41% were very satisfied and another 43% were somewhat satisfied. A slightly lower 38% were very satisfied with the instructional program, with 48% somewhat

satisfied. At least 90% of all the students were at least somewhat satisfied with almost all other programs and services; the only exception being the price of books in the College Book Store, something over which the College has little, if any, control. Finally, over 48% of those exiting reported that they would definitely recommend the College to a friend in a similar situation, while another 42% would probably recommend it.

II. Student Follow-up Questionnaire

The Student Follow-up Questionnaire, administered to former GSJC students a year after leaving the College, asks about their educational and career progress since leaving. The elapsed year gives them adequate opportunity to evaluate their academic preparation in relation to their further educational and career experience. Of some 2700 students leaving the College in 1976-77 for whom valid addresses were available, 1140 (42%) responded to the survey administered in January, 1978.

Educational Progress since Leaving GSJC--Forty-one percent enrolled in another degree program since leaving Gadsden State. Not surprisingly, 58% of students enrolled in transfer degree programs were enrolled in a degree program; more unexpectedly, 30% of students enrolled in career education programs were enrolled in a degree program elsewhere. Of those who were enrolled, 77% were working toward a bachelor's degree, with 12% working toward an associate's degree. Of the career education students enrolled elsewhere, 70% were working toward the bachelor's, confirming our career education goal of imparting a continuing commitment to

learning. Still more striking, a majority (53%) of the former career education students intend ultimately to complete a bachelor's degree or higher.

Success in Transferring Credits--Gadsden State has resolved most of its articulation problems with senior institutions. Fully 88% of those tranferring elsewhere experienced no difficulty in transferring. The surveys did not find out how many credit hours were not transferred, if any, and the reasons they did not transfer. These questions are being explored in the 1978-79 survey.

Satisfaction with GSJC Preparation for Transfer Institution--Results here were mixed. Forty-six percent of those who transferred considered their GSJC preparation good, 45% considered it fair, and slightly over 8% considered it inadequate. Perhaps some of our former students are experiencing transfer shock. But the average first time grade point average (GPA) for those who knew it was 2.67 (B-), and a separate study by Auburn University revealed that the most recent class of GSJC students transferring to Auburn had virtually the same GPA as the average junior college transfer student at Auburn.

Career Progress since Leaving GSJC--The vast majority of our former students are in the labor force. Fifty-four percent had a full-time job a year after leaving GSJC while another 34% were looking for one. This is true of former transfer students as well as career education students; 42% of the former transfer students were employed full-time and another 31% were on the job market. This is another indication that GSJC is following

the national trend away from the "lock-step" of four consecutive years of college and toward greater integration of work with education.

Those holding jobs regard their jobs favorably. Forty-four percent considered their job to have definite career potential, while another 26% felt their job had possible career potential. On the other hand, fewer than a quarter (22%) reported that their job was specifically related to their GSJC major, with another 28% considering it somewhat related. And those whose job was unrelated to their major did not seem too anxious to get back into their GSJC field. Only 29% had actually looked for a job in their field, while fewer than half (48%) expressed willingness to move to another community to get a job in their field. Career education students were even more reluctant than transfer students to move. A very substantial majority of jobholders (79%) were already working at their job before leaving Gadsden State. Over half (51%) the jobholders were making over ten thousand dollars per year; another 32% were making between six and ten thousand; 15% were making more than fifteen thousand. This pattern held for transfer and career education students alike. These results suggest the strong ties that many of our students have to their community and their jobs. GSJC is viewed as a resource for long-term occupational and personal advancement rather than a separate and distinct experience.

Satisfaction with GSJC Preparation for Jobs--Half the jobholders felt GSJC had given them good preparation for their jobs; another

31% considered their preparation fair; and 19% considered it inadequate. The quality of GSJC preparation for work was explored in greater detail in the employer follow-up survey, as reported below.

III. Employer Follow-up Questionnaire

The students themselves are sometimes not the best judges of their job performance or their preparation for the job. To obtain a different, perhaps more informed appraisal, a separate questionnaire was administered to the employers of the former students. Of 566 questionnaires mailed out, 39 (7%) were undeliverable, 400 (71%) were returned, and 372 (66%) were usable.

Evaluation of Personal Skills--Employers were asked to rate how well qualified the employee (former student) is on ten personal skills areas. These areas consisted of accepting responsibility, punctuality, personal initiative, willingness to learn, co-worker and management cooperation, work attendance and attitude, personal appearance, and compliance with policies. At least 87% of the employers rated the former students good or very good. Highest marks (53% very good) were given for willingness to learn and work attendance, while lowest marks went to personal initiative (only 38% very good).

Evaluation of Technical Skills--Eleven technical skill areas were rated by the employers, including mathematical skills, technical knowledge, organizational ability, communication skills, problem solving skills, work quality and quantity, manual dexterity, meeting the public, following instructions, and operating equipment.

The former students' technical skills were rated slightly lower than personal skills. In all eleven skills areas, at least 77% of the employers rated their employees' qualifications "good" or "very good". However, in contrast with the personal skill ratings, technical skills were rated "good" considerably more often than "very good". "Following instructions" and "work quality" were given highest marks, with 44% of the employers giving "very good" ratings, followed by "meeting the public", with 42% checking "very good". At the bottom of the list were problem-solving skills (27% rated "very good"), organizational ability (28% "very good"), communication skills (28% "very good"), and mathematical skills (30% "very good"). These relatively low scores lend justification to the College's priority efforts in developmental studies.

Career education majors rated about the same as transfer program students in most categories, but fared notably less well in mathematical skills (26% "very good" for career students vs. 37% "very good" for transfer students), organizational skills (25% vs. 36% "very good"), problem-solving skills (25% vs. 35% "very good"), and work quality (40% vs. 54% "very good").

Overall Evaluation by Employers--Employers were also asked for an overall rating of the training their employees received as it relates to their job. A third rated it "very good", while about a half rated it "good". The transfer students were given better marks for overall training than the career program students (40% rated "very good" vs. 31%).

77

A majority of the employers (62%) felt that the former students' training had added to their ability for job placement and advancement, and an even larger majority (71%) felt that the former students were better prepared for their job than employees without such training.

Employers' Suggestions for Program Improvement--Employers were asked to suggest improvements that the College could make in the technical or personal skills of future employees. In many instances the students were working in fields unrelated to their field of study of GSJC. In these cases, comments about deficiencies in specific job-related skills were not relevant. But a number of more general observations were widely shared.

The most widely made comment concerned the need for more job-related or on-the-job training. The transition from the academic environment to the work environment in general seems to be a difficult one for a number of students. Several employers felt that simply more time on the job would solve this problem. The implication for the College is that opportunities for cooperative work internships and other means of exposing students to the working environment should be expanded.

Many of the comments dealt with generalized work-related skills rather than with specific academic or technical skills. The most frequently noted deficiencies were in the areas of initiative, problem-solving, communication skills, and on-the-job human relations with customers, co-workers, and supervisors. These are the kinds of skills that can "slip through the cracks"

in a curriculum that is divided up according to subject-matter areas. There are ways to teach them, however, and perhaps the subject matter specialists at the College should look into ways of incorporating them into the curriculum.

Policy Implications

Gadsden State appears to be on the right track for meeting the needs of its "new" students. Year-round instruction, the Evening College, off-campus centers, extended cafeteria hours, financial aid programs, remedial studies, and flexible entry and exit policies are making programs accessible to older working people that otherwise might be beyond their reach.

The results suggest that some further "retooling" of existing programs and services may be in order:

(1) Curriculum revision: The deficiencies noted by the employers of former students in certain generalized world-of-work skills, including communication, problem-solving, initiative, and human relations, could be attacked through further emphasis of these areas in the existing courses or possibly through additional courses.

(2) Cooperative work-education programs: The "shock" experienced by students in moving from the academic environment to the world of work, as reported by employers might be offset through the expansion of cooperative internship offerings and other arrangements that expose the student to the work environment while enrolled at the College.

(3) Career development: There does not seem to be a very good fit between the jobs held by students after leaving the College and the fields of study they pursued while enrolled. This is not necessarily a negative reflection on the College; students are free to enroll in the programs of their choice, with few exceptions. However, if students are better informed about careers and have carefully defined their career goals through the use of the advisement and career development services, many of them might choose a course of study at the College that is more consistent with their present or future careers.

(4) Advisement: A large number of students attend the College intermittently and without intending to complete an associate's degree. For these students, the advisement process should be focused on developing an individual educational plan based on their occupational, educational, and personal goals and the constraints imposed by career, family, finances, previous education, etc.

(5) Student and program evaluation: For the large number of students whose goal is something short of an associate's degree, such traditional measures of student or program performance as degrees awarded are meaningless. For this large proportion of the student body, student or program performance can only be captured by assessing the extent to which these students have achieved the goals contained in their individual educational plans (see 4 above). For these students, carefully defined criteria for mastery of individual courses provide a more meaningful measure of their educational progress than completion of a program of study that was designed years before they arrived.

OPERATIONAL DATA

ORIGINATOR: B/Director of Planning & Research
DISTRIBUTION: W/All Planning Book Holders
SUBJECT: 1977-78 Achievement of Institutional Goals

	THIS	REPLACES
FILE:	103.001	103
DATE:	10/9/78	2/9/78
PAGE:	1 OF 6	1-19 OF 1

Institutional Goal 1: Student Educational Development

1.01-1.04 Educational Goal Attainment

1.01 Achievement of Educational Goals

Goal	Number Having Goal	Number Achieving Goal	Number Achieving Goal
Complete courses needed to transfer	322	267	83%
Discover vocational interest	229	184	80%
Prepare for new career	302	251	83%
Improve skills for present job	187	159	85%
Increase chances for raise	150	122	81%
Enrich personal life	317	281	89%
Improve ability to get along with others	295	265	90%
ALL GOALS	1,802	1,529	85%

Source: Respondents to Exiting Student Questionnaire, 1977-78, questions 9-15.

1.02 Completion of Degree Requirements

Degree Status When Left	Actual Number	Actual Percent	Planned Percent
No Degree	759	71.3	
Less than one year	60	5.6	
One year or more	44	4.1	
Associate Degree	202	19.0	65%
No Response	45	Missing	
TOTAL	1,110	100.0[1]	

Source: Student Follow-up Questionnaire, 1977-78, question 8.

1.03 Course Completion Rate by Non-degree Seekers. Information not available.

[1]Columns may not total to 100.0 due to rounding.

ORIGINATOR: B/Director of Planning & REsearch
DISTRIBUTION: W/All Planning Book Holders
SUBJECT: 1977-78 Achievement of Institutional Goals

	THIS	REPLACES
FILE:	103.001	103
DATE:	10.9/78	2/9/78
PAGE:	2 OF 6	2-19 OF 2

1.04 Willingness to Recommend GSJC to Others

	Number	Percent
Definitely Not	13	3.1
Probably Not	29	6.9
Probably Yes	175	41.8
Definitely Yes	202	48.2
TOTAL	419	100.0[1]

Source: Exiting Student Questionnaire, 1977-78, question 73.

1.05-1.08 Transfer Performance Indicators

1.05 Rate of Transfer to Senior Institutions

Enrollment Status	Number	Percent
Enrolled in another degree program	437	40.7
Did not enroll in another degree program	637	59.3
No response	36	Missing
TOTAL	1,110	100.0[1]

Degree Sought	Number	Percent
Associates Degree	53	11.8
Bachelors Degree	344	76.6
Masters Degree	26	5.8
Professional Degree	22	4.9
Doctors Degree	4	0.9
No Response	661	Missing
TOTAL	1,110	100.0[1]

Source: Student Follow-up Questionnaire, 1977-78, questions 13 and 16.

[1]Columns may not total to 100.0 due to rounding.

OPERATIONAL DATA

ORIGINATOR: B/Director of Planning & Research
DISTRIBUTION: W/All Planning Book Holders
SUBJECT: 1977-78 Achievement of Institutional Goals

	THIS	REPLACES
FILE:	103.001	103
DATE:	10/9/78	2/9/78
PAGE:	3 OF 6	3-19 OF 3

1.06 Success in Transferring Credit

	Number	Percent
Had no difficulty transferring credit	386	86.7
Had difficulty	55	12.4
Miscoded	4	0.8
No Response	665	Missing
TOTAL	1,110	100.0[1]

Source: Student Follow-up Questionnaire, 1977-78, question 18.

1.07 Satisfaction with GSJC Preparation for Senior Institution

	Actual Number	Actual Percent	Planned Percent
Inadequate preparation	38	8.4	
Fair Preparation	204	45.2	
Good Preparation	207	45.9	80%
Miscoded	2	0.4	
No response	659	Missing	
TOTAL	1,110	100.0[1]	

Source: Student Follow-up Questionnaire, 1977-78, question 17.

1.08 Academic Standing at Senior Institution

First Term Grade Point Average	Number	Percent	Planned
Less than 2.0	64	14.3	
2.0 to 2.5	80	17.9	
2.6 to 3.0	72	16.1	
3.1 to 3.5	41	9.2	80%
3.6 to 4.0	58	12.9	
Do not know	133	29.7	
No response	662	Missing	
TOTAL	1,110	100.0[1]	

Source: Student Follow-up Questionnaire, 1977-78, question 19.

[1]Columns may not total to 100.0 due to rounding.

OPERATIONAL DATA

		THIS	REPLACES
ORIGINATOR:	B/Director of Planning & Research	FILE: 103.001	103
DISTRIBUTION:	W/All Planning Book Holders	DATE: 10/9/78	2/9/78
SUBJECT:	1977-78 Achievement of Institutional Goals	PAGE: 4 OF 6	4-19 of 4

1.09-1.13 Occupational Performance Indicators

1.09 Success at Occupational Certification Examinations

	Actual Number	Actual Percent	Planned Percent
Did not take examination	928	85.9	65% of
Took - Passed	112	10.4	those attempting
Took - Did not pass	22	2.0	would pass in 3
Took - No results yet	18	1.7	attempts
No Response	30	Missing	
TOTAL	1,110	100.0[1]	

Source: Student Follow-up Questionnaire, 1977-78, question 12.

1.10 Success at Getting Job in Major Field

Have job?	Number	Percent
Yes	567	53.6
No-am not looking	361	34.1
No-am looking	127	12.0
Miscoded	3	0.3
No response	52	Missing
TOTAL	1,110	100.0[1]

Note: 79.2% of jobholders report holding that job before coming to GSJC.

How Student Regards Job	Number	Percent
Definite career potential	255	43.7
Possible career potential	151	25.9
Deciding on kind of work	64	11.0
To make money for something else	42	7.2
Looking for job in field	26	4.5
Looking for better job	45	7.7
No response	527	Missing
TOTAL	1,110	100.0[1]

[1]Columns may not total to 100.0 due to rounding.

ORIGINATOR: B/Director of Planning & Research
DISTRIBUTION: W/All Planning Book Holders
SUBJECT: 1977-78 Achievement of Institutional Goals

	THIS	REPLACES
FILE:	103.001	103
DATE:	10/9/78	2/9/78
PAGE:	5 OF 6	5-19 of 5

Relation to Job to GSJC Program	Number	Percent
Not related	288	48.9
Somewhat related	167	28.4
Specifically related	132	22.4
Miscoded	2	0.3
No response	521	Missing
TOTAL	1,110	100.0[1]

Source: Student Follow-up Questionnaire, 1977-78, questions 22, 24, 28, and 29.

1.11 Satisfaction with GSJC Preparation for Job.

Preparation was	Actual Number	Actual Percent	Planned Percent
Inadequate	92	18.7	
Fair	150	30.5	
Good	242	49.3	80%
Miscoded	7	1.4	
No Response	619	Missing	
TOTAL	1,110	100.0[1]	

Source: Student Follow-up Questionnaire, 1977-78, question 26.

1.12 Satisfaction of Supervisor with GSJC Preparation for Job. Information not available.

1.13 Willingness of Supervisor to Employ Other GSJC Graduates. Information not available.

[1]Columns may not total to 100.0 due to rounding.

OPERATIONAL DATA

ORIGINATOR: B/Director of Planning & Research
DISTRIBUTION: W/All Planning Book Holders
SUBJECT: 1977-78 Achievement of Institutional Goals

	THIS	REPLACES
FILE:	103.001	103
DATE:	10/9/78	2/9/78
PAGE:	6 OF 6	6-19 OF 6

Institutional Goal 2: Student Personal Development

2.01 Ability to Formulate Career & Educational Plans

Of 229 respondents who listed as a goal "Discovering my Vocational Interest", 184, or 80%, reported achieving it.[2]

No./% identifying long-range career goal: information not presently available.

Of the 1110 respondents, 1017, or 91.6% identified the highest degree they plan to attain.[3]

No./% identifying long-range field of study: information not presently available.

Institutional Goal 3: Community Development

3.01 Student Participation in College-sponsored Event

	Number	Percent
Never/No Response	293	64.1
Once or Twice	102	22.3
Once or Twice per quarter	37	8.1
At least once per month	25	5.5
TOTAL	457	100.0[1]

[1]Columns may not total to 100.0 due to rounding.

[2]Source: Exiting Student Questionnaire, 1977-78.

[3]Source: Student Follow-up Questionnaire, 1977-78.

Gadsden State Junior College
GEORGE WALLACE DRIVE • GADSDEN, ALABAMA 35903

MEMORANDUM

TO: Former GSJC Students requesting results of Student Questionnaire

FROM: John A. Bers
Director of Planning & Research

DATE: January 30, 1979

Last year you completed a questionnaire for the College shortly before leaving and asked that a copy of the results be sent to you. I am pleased to send you the enclosed Highlights of the study of which the Exiting Student Questionnaire was a part. I thought you might find the results interesting.

Many thanks for helping the College with this study.

Gadsden State Junior College

GEORGE WALLACE DRIVE • GADSDEN, ALABAMA 35903

MEMORANDUM

TO: GSJC Faculty and Administration

FROM: John A. Bers
Director of Planning & Research

DATE: January 29, 1979

RE: Institutional Study #79-1

Attached you will find one of the fruits of a cooperative endeavor extending over at least a two year period: A summary, analysis, and implications of the student and employer follow-up questionnaires that have been administered in the past two years. The results provide us a unique picture of Gadsden State as our "clients" see us, and I think you will find it fascinating.

I want to express my appreciation to all those who contributed time and effort to this project: the faculty members who administered the questionnaires, the students and employers who took the time to fill them out and in many cases to offer valuable additional comments, the Computer Center for many hours of programming, key punching, and processing, and finally--and especially--my secretary, Ms. Susan Pate, for the untold hours of formating, labeling, stuffing, logging, and typing that this project entailed.

Gadsden State Junior College

GEORGE WALLACE DRIVE • GADSDEN, ALABAMA 35903

MEMORANDUM

TO: Employers Responding to GSJC Employer Follow-up Questionnaire

FROM: John A. Bers
Director of Planning & Research

DATE: January 30, 1979

RE: Highlights of Survey Results

I want to thank all of you who took the time to complete an Employer Follow-up Questionnaire last October and November. The results have been analyzed and reported to professional staff and program administrators throughout the College for use in evaluating and improving their programs. I especially want to thank those of you who offered additional comments on the questionnaires; they proved especially valuable.

I thought you might be interested in how the results looked, so I am enclosing a copy of the Highlights of the study of which the Employer Follow-up Questionnaire was a part.

Again, many thanks for your participation in this project.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC® CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
EE 36

APR 25 1980